LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921 Editor: R. Palme Dutt

RHODESIA – WHAT NEXT?

The Editor

★

PROFIT AND 'PROFITS'

Professor Y. Liberman

★

WEST GERMANY

Nuclear Arms—Quaestor

Incorrigible Warmongers—D. N. Pritt

★

Conference of African States—J. Bukari

The Great Trainmen's Robbery—R. Bonnar

DECEMBER 1965

Two Shillings

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY

VOL. XLVII No. 12 DECEMBER . 1965

CONTENTS

Page

Notes of the Month: Rhodesia—What Next? *A Slave Owners' Revolt—Whose Guilt?—Green Light for Smith—Whose Subversion?—Complaints After the Event—Echoes of the Thirties—Africa's Voice—Red Bogy—Police State—Phony War?—What Kind of Economic Sanctions?—A Dubious Strategy—The Fight for African Freedom Will Go Forward*.....**R.P.D.** 529

Profit and 'Profits'. Soviet Economist exposes the confusion in the Press on the question of profits under socialism.....**Y. Liberman** 542

Nuclear Arms and West Germany. The need for a real agreement against the further spreading of nuclear weapons.....**Quaestor** 548

The Great Trainmen's Robbery. Leading trade unionist shows the dangers in the Railway Board's agreement with the Footplatemen **R. Bonnar** 558

Conference of African States. The Independent African States lead the fight for majority government in Rhodesia.....**J. Bukari** 562

Incorrigible Warmongers. An exposure of the Nazis in high office in West Germany and their dangerous aims.....**D. N. Pritt** 566

Illustration: An artist's horror at the Vietnam aggression 552-3

Forty Years Ago 557

Book Reviews: 'Success and Failure of Picasso', John Berger: *B. Niven*; 'Education and the Labour Movement', Brian Simon: *H. J. Fyrth.* 569

Index 572

Hands Off! ..... **Helen Falber** 576

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes of the Month

RHODESIA — WHAT NEXT ?

The United Nations General Assembly today decided, in the face of British objections, to call on Britain to take 'all necessary measures, including military force, to bring about immediately in Rhodesia the suspension of the constitution, the release of political prisoners, and the convening of a constitutional conference, based on adult suffrage, with a view to fixing the earliest possible date for independence'.

The Times, November 6, 1965, summary of United Nations resolution carried by 82 votes to 9 on November 5, 1965—six days before the Smith coup.

November 14, 1965

The battle for African liberation is reaching its highest climax yet with the Smith racialists' coup in Rhodesia on November 11. This coup, like so many previous coups of a fascist type in many countries in the modern era, was only made possible by the preceding typically social-democratic nervelessness and procrastination (not to call it complicity) of the Wilson régime through the endlessly prolonged negotiations while the Smith gang openly made ready, alongside the ill-disguised sympathies of Toryism with the plotters. The battle for elementary democratic freedom and national independence against an open police state of racial suppression is not merely the cause of the oppressed Rhodesian people. It can be no separate concern of Britain alone—although the first responsibility rests on the British people, in view of the constitutional position, to compel their Government to act. It is the common cause of all the peoples of Africa, of all the peoples of the world, and of all supporters of freedom against racialism. In any comments written within a couple of days of the coup it would be premature to endeavour to measure yet the full world-wide consequences which will follow from this blow of reaction, or the forms which the further development of the battle will take. But this much is certain. The battle will go forward until the final victory of the forces of freedom. The interests of African freedom and of world peace demand the unconditional defeat and destruction of the racialist régime in Rhodesia.

A Slave Owners' Revolt

In vain the petty colour-bar dictators of Rhodesia seek to invoke

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the memory of the great American Revolution and the American Declaration of Independence. The American Revolution was a great democratic revolution, the precursor and in many respects the direct inspirer of the French Revolution, which in its turn was the precursor of the further advance, in a new historical era, to the higher level represented by the Russian Revolution. The American Revolution was the second of the three great bourgeois-democratic revolutions, the English, the American and the French, which each in their time represented the vanguard of human progressive advance, and established the never to be forgotten revolutionary foundation (however reactionary the outcome today in the era of monopoly capitalism) of the leading capitalist states, Britain, France and the United States. The Rhodesian coup belongs to the record of counter-revolution. It represents the rearguard action of a fanatical racialist minority, doomed to defeat, to turn back the wheel of history; to block and reverse the advancing African Revolution; and with their puny breaths to blow back that 'wind of change' which even a Tory Premier has had to recognise as governing the future in Africa.

A Parallel—With a Difference

But there is just one ironic parallel which Ian Smith and his Simon Legree cronies could have drawn with some effect, if they had had any sense of historical reality in their philistine heads, and not been concerned merely to make an empty rhetorical flourish in the hope of filching a rag of respectability to cover a piece of die-hard backwoodsmen's treason. The ever-memorable words of the American Declaration of Independence, drafted by Thomas Jefferson and adopted by the Continental Congress at Philadelphia on July 4, 1776, proclaimed:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.

When the delegates at Philadelphia, the city of brotherly love, adopted this ringing affirmation of their faith, whose words were destined to inspire generation after generation in the struggle for freedom, it certainly never occurred to them that their 'self-evident' axiom that 'all men are created equal' with an equal right to 'liberty' applied to their African slaves. George Washington was a large-scale slave-owner. It was no doubt this characteristic anomaly in the foundations of American bourgeois democracy which led

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Samuel Johnson, no lover of Americans (he used to say: 'I am willing to love all mankind, except an American'), to make the biting comment in 1775: 'How is it that we hear the loudest yelps for liberty among the drivers of Negroes?' If Ian Smith had been clever, he might have chosen this analogy to try to cover his shame.

A Shameless Claim

But even this analogy is lame. African slavery was, it is true, inbred in the foundations of American democracy, just as the African slave trade laid the foundations of the great English fortunes (Gladstone's father was a slave trader, and one of Gladstone's earliest speeches in parliament was in defence of slavery). The price of this canker at the heart of Anglo-American democracy was the civil war a century later and the bitter struggle which is having to be waged still today for Negro civil rights. But the Negro slave population was under half a million in a total colonial population of three and a half millions at the time of the foundation of the United States in 1776, or under one seventh. It was an overwhelming White majority which was demanding freedom from the fetters of colonialism and the rule of George III. In Rhodesia the European population is 217,000 and the African population just under four millions, together with 12,400 'Coloured' and 7,900 Asians. Thus the leaders of a tiny White minority of the population, amounting to five per cent, have proclaimed their racial dictatorship over the African 95 per cent and have dared to invoke in defence of this the memory of the glorious American democratic revolution. The attempted analogy boomerangs in their face.

Whose Guilt?

But the real responsibility for the shameful racialist coup in Rhodesia on Armistice Day, 1965, does not rest primarily with the bigoted or indoctrinated majority of the European settlers. The real guilt needs to be placed squarely where it belongs, with British imperialism, and with the political leaders of British imperialism, acting on behalf of some of the wealthiest and most powerful British monopolies entrenched in Rhodesia. It was the Tory Government in 1923 which, with Labour acquiescence, established the anomaly of a so-called 'self-governing colony' in Southern Rhodesia in the interests of the settlers, that is, in practice self-governing in respect of the White settlers and colonial in respect of the African 95 per cent deprived of rights. It was the Tory Govern-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment in 1953 which, again with practical Labour acquiescence, imposed the arbitrary and indefensible and unworkable 'Central African Federation' to hand over what were then the colonies of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland to the tender mercies of the Southern Rhodesian racialists, against the overwhelming and outspoken opposition of the Africans of all three territories. When the Central African Federation broke down, and independence had to be conceded to Zambia and Malawi, it was the Tory Government which began the endless negotiations with Smith and the Rhodesian Front to seek to find a figleaf formula to cover the reality of racialist 'independence' with hopes and promises for the future—negotiations which the Wilson Labour Government continued on the same basis laid down by Home, playing into the hands of Smith and his plotters to prepare their coup.

Green Light For Smith

From the outset of the interminable negotiations Harold Wilson, while making a great show of stern words that a unilateral declaration of independence would be treason, simultaneously explained no less emphatically that he would on no account take the normal consequent action against treason, and that, while he was busily engaged in sending massive troops and planes and warships to Aden or Malaysia to quell into submission any non-Whites who dared to challenge the rule of Britain, in the case of Rhodesia, if the rule of Britain were overthrown by White racialists, he would guarantee beforehand not to use force against them. This preliminary tip-off was of course the green light for Smith, which made the rest of the wordy palaver meaningless. When the Mission of the Commonwealth Secretary Bottomley, and the Lord Chancellor, Lord Gardiner, went to Rhodesia for ten days in February, 1965, the African national leaders were in detention. There was no protest from Britain or demand for their release. Instead, after they had heard from Smith his intention to declare his racialist dictatorship with or without Britain's consent, Bottomley returned to announce in parliament that Britain would not use force against him.

> Reporting to parliament yesterday on the results of the 10-day mission to Rhodesia, the Commonwealth Secretary, Mr. Arthur Bottomley, said flatly that there will be no attempt by the present British Government to use military means to force through constitutional changes and bring about African majority rule (*Guardian*, March 9, 1965).

This meant that the gates were opened for Smith to act.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Whose 'Subversion'?

Premier Wilson went further. On November 1, that is, within a few days of the coup, in an interview on Panorama, he handed out to Smith, whom he called 'a great leader', the indispensable guarantee required by Smith for his action.

> I think it would be wrong to use force to try and get a constitutional solution. The only conditions in which I could foresee force being used would be if while we still had responsiblity—assuming no U.D.I. or anything of that kind—there was an outbreak of disorder, murder, subversion, whether it came from African or European extremists. In those circumstances we would certainly have to consider that.

So he recognised conditions in which he might use force while Smith was building up his plot, throwing African leaders into prison and establishing his reign of terror. Not against Smith. Britain would use force against 'subversion'—of course impartially, whether it came from either side, 'whether it came from African or European extremists'. But the 'European extremists' were in power. They were exercising a White racialist dictatorship. A dictatorship does not conduct 'subversion' against itself. The only 'subversion' could come from the Africans struggling against the dictatorship. Thus, under a transparently hypocritical cover of pretending that he might use force against 'subversion' from either side, he was in fact declaring that he would use force only against the Africans, but never on the side of democracy or, in the words of Bottomley, to 'bring about African majority rule'. Smith took the plain hint passed him by Wilson on November 1. On November 5 he established his state of emergency to complete his iron grip on Rhodesia. On November 11 he carried out his coup.

Who Bluffed Whom?

Faced with the manifest and now indisputable failure of the prolonged and futile negotiations, which only gave Smith and his gang time to complete their illegal preparations, Wilson and his Labour Ministers now seek to excuse themselves by claiming that they succeeded by spinning out the endless interchanges in delaying the unilateral declaration of independence and thus gained time. This plea remarkably recalls Chamberlain's similar apology for Munich, after its breakdown had become obvious and war had followed, that he had succeeded in buying time. But of course the advantage went to Hitler. And in the same way the advantage went to Smith. Indeed, already in a speech on August 27 this year Smith was boasting of the success of his technique in outmanoeuvring

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Labour Government. He referred to the 'incredible remarks' made by Bottomley that 'Britain had averted a unilateral declaration of independence by Rhodesia last October'. On this Smith commented:

> I can only say that if the British Government seriously believed we were on the edge of taking independence last October I am agreeably surprised at how effective our technique at bluffiing the rest of the world has been. We knew at that time we were not ready.

Precisely. Prompt action could have scotched the plot, compelled the release of the African leaders and the convening of a constitutional conference before Smith had had time to mobilise his forces. The technique of 'spinning out' the negotiations (Prince Philip's phrase in his speech at Edinburgh on July 2 when he recommended: 'It is better to spin out the process of the solution; a few years here or there do not matter') meant buying time for Smith.

Complaints After the Event

The subsequent bitter complaint of Wilson in Parliament on November 12, after the blow had fallen, that he had been let down by Smith; that he had conceded every possible point to Smith until there was nothing left to concede ('I proved beyond any reasonable doubt that every point they had made was fully dealt with on terms that must be satisfactory to them'); his pitiful satisfaction that he was 'glad to think that Mr. Smith at any rate agrees with the claim that I have done everything any man could do'; his disillusioned lament over his 'heavy heart' that 'reason had left the scene' and that Smith must have been all the time, even while they conducted on the phone 'almost a friendly conversation', in reality 'hellbent' on evil courses—all this recalls nothing so much as Chamberlain's lamentation in Parliament and in his broadcast on September 3, 1939, that he had been let down by Hitler; that he had done everything to make possible for Hitler 'a peaceful and honourable settlement'; that on this 'sad day' of 'a bitter blow' for him all he had worked for had 'crashed into ruins'; that 'no word given by Hitler could be trusted' any more; and that they were confronted with 'evil things'. There followed then the phony war.

Echoes of the Thirties

Indeed all too many echoes of the Appeasement of the thirties are recalled by the Rhodesian story. The initial deferment of oil sanctions, whatever may be the calculation of holding this as a card

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in reserve to defeat more positive action by the United Nations, inevitably recalls the experience of the Italian war on Abyssinia and the fiasco of the limited League of Nations sanctions, when the British Government fought to the last and in this case successfully to prevent oil sanctions, and Sir John Simon let the cat out of the bag with his customary naïveté by declaring that it would be unthinkable to impose oil sanctions since if this were done the war could not go on. The dramatic flight of Wilson to Salisbury at the height of the crisis amid wishes of godspeed from all parties in Parliament (this time there was no Gallacher) inevitably awoke for many memories of Chamberlain's dramatic flight to Munich; although this time the efforts of Wilson to bully the African leaders into accepting Smith's demand that they should work the 1961 Constitution fortunately met with resolute refusal. Equally the memories of Non-Intervention in Spain, when the cause of Spanish Democracy was the common cause of all the peoples of the world, come back to mind every time Wilson reaffirms his supreme objective to keep out other nations, whether African or non-African, from intervening with direct help to the Rhodesian people in their struggle for freedom against racialist dictatorship.

Warnings In Advance

Warnings of the course and consequences of Appeasement, and demands for action in time, were not lacking in the thirties. Nor have they been lacking in the years preceding the Rhodesian coup. It was already in September 1963 that Britain vetoed the resolution of the African States in the Security Council on what was then Southern Rhodesia; but the Assembly in November passed the same resolution by 73 votes to 2. It was in the summer of 1964 that the United Nations delegation came to London and reported back that its members were 'disagreeably surprised' to find that the United Kingdom Ministers had shown 'constant concern for the possible reactions of the White settlers if an attempt were made to implement United Nations resolutions, whereas they were not in the least concerned about the possible reaction of the four million Africans in Southern Rhodesia if they continued to be denied the most elementary rights'. The U.N. delegation condemned the British Government's attitude as 'a flagrant denial of its responsibilities to protect the interests of the majority and a deplorable refusal to discharge its obligations under the Charter and under the resolutions of the General Assembly'. It called on the British Govern-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment to release political prisoners, repeal all repressive and discriminatory legislation, remove all restrictions on African political activity, and convene a constitutional conference. The report of the delegation was endorsed by the U.N. Special Committee on Colonialism by 20 votes to nil with three abstentions, and the issue was forwarded to the Security Council. The final warning call of the United Nations before the explosion was the resolution of the Assembly on November 5 for 'all necessary measures, including military force' to suspend the constitution, release political prisoners, and convene a constitutional conference based on adult suffrage with a view to establishing democratic independence. The decisions of the United Nations, to which all political parties in Britain love to profess loyalty as the supposed sheet-anchor of their foreign policy, were thus sufficiently clear. Had they been carried out, the coup could never have taken place.

Africa's Voice

Even more explicit were the warnings and the calls for decisive action in time from all the African states. The Commonwealth Premiers' Conference in June of this year almost broke down on the question of Rhodesia; and a single communiqué was only adopted in the end on the basis of recording separately that the 'responsibility' lay with Britain, but that 'the British Prime Minister was urged by other Prime Ministers' to take action 'within three months' to convene a constitutional conference with free participation of all political leaders in order to establish democratic independence on a basis of majority rule. In October the Conference of the Organisation of African Unity at Accra recorded the unanimous resolution of the leaders of the 28 independent African states represented, calling on Britain to suspend the Rhodesian constitution immediately; to use force if necessary and to convene a constitutional conference of representatives of the entire population. The resolution further recommended all member states 'to use every possible means, including armed force, to prevent a unilateral declaration of independence' if Britain failed to take the necessary measures to stop it; and also recommended member states to 'extend immediate assistance to the Zimbabwe (Rhodesian) people with a view to establishing a majority government'. This was three weeks before the coup.

Red Bogy

But the most sinister parallel with the Appeasement of the thir-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ties, far more significant than any incidental fleeting analogies, is the underlying motive for Britain's resistance to the repeated calls equally of the African states and of the United Nations. The reason which led the dominant British statesmen of the thirties, despite their recognition of the rivalries of interests of British and German imperialism, to back Hitler, to assist his rearmament, to gloss over the evils of fascism, and to connive at his successive aggressions (even while always 'deploring' them) was their deep-seated anti-Communist and anti-Soviet obsession, which led them to see all the time the Soviet Union and not Nazi Germany as the main danger, until the remorseless judgement of the event finally brought the collapse of all their calculations and compelled them to accept with eagerness the alliance which they had so long rejected. Similarly Harold Wilson, with that deep-seated anti-Communist and anti-Soviet obsession which has always ever since 1917 distorted the judgement of the top ranks of Labour's leadership in all questions of foreign policy, has revealed more and more clearly with every utterance that he has seen the problem of Rhodesian racialism and the African states, with his vain attempts to square both, not as primarily a problem of the African struggle for freedom, but in terms of the cold war. Thus it was characteristic that in his speech in Parliament on November 12, immediately following the racialist coup and open treason, he should paint before his hearers in vivid terms the horrors, not of the real sufferings of the millions of Africans under the heel of a racialist dictatorship, but of a hypothetical picture of 'the Red Army' marching into Africa. Thereby was revealed the mentality which underlay Munich. But those days belong to the past.

Police State

Similarly Rhodesia is now described in British Government statements as having become since Smith's State of Emergency 'a police state'. But Rhodesia was already a police state for years before, and was described as such by constitutional authorities ever since the notorious Law and Order (Maintenance) Act of 1960. When Britain finally broke with Hitler in 1939, after Hitler had shattered their calculations by signing a non-aggression pact with the Soviet Union, the British Government immediately issued a White Paper on the Nazi concentration camps, whose murderous barbarities had been in full operation throughout the preceding six years, during which British official policy had been building up

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hitler and British statesmen (Churchill included) had been praising him as a great leader, and the horrors had only been described in the left-wing press to be passed over in silence by official circles or discounted as grossly exaggerated. So with Rhodesia. Not only the denial of political rights to the African majority, but draconian legislation and decrees to crush African political organisation had gone on for years. Yet the British Government which, whenever African or other states protested, replied that it alone had responsibility for Rhodesia as its own internal affair, refused to intervene or insist even on the right of existence of African national organisations. The African National Congress was banned. When the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act was introduced in 1960, its provisions were so outrageous that the Federal Chief Justice, Sir Robert Tredgold, resigned in protest, describing it as 'evil and a threat to the rule of law' and declaring:

> It will remove any lingering vestige of doubt whether Southern Rhodesia can properly be called a police state . . . it outrages every basic human right.

That was already in 1960, not 1965. The National Democratic Party, successor to the African National Congress, organised an unofficial referendum on the 1961 Constitution, and recorded nearly 500,000 against. Thereupon the National Democratic Party was also banned. The Zimbabwe African People's Union (Z.A.P.U.), which took its place, called for the boycott of the 1961 Constitution of African enslavement. Thereupon Z.A.P.U. was also banned, its leaders arrested, and an amendment passed to the Unlawful Organisations Act to forbid any organisation being formed to replace it. Such was Harold Wilson's 'rule of law' before November 11, 1965, against which the British Government refused to take action.

Phony War?

Now, when at last, despite all the concessions and entreaties by Wilson, which only gave Smith time to complete his mobilisation, the break has been made, not by Wilson, but by Smith. Wilson has been forced to make a stand. But what kind of stand? Certainly a great outward show of sternness is made. Smith is declared guilty of treason. His government is declared to be deposed and no longer a government, but a group of private citizens unlawfully assuming the rights of a government, and therefore enemies of the Queen. Relations are broken off and High Commissioners are recalled. Rhodesia is excluded from the sterling area, from imperial

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

preference, from aid and credit facilities; extensive trade bans are imposed, including on tobacco and sugar. But the more these stern measures are examined in practice, the more a fog of ambiguity descends upon them. Smith and his Ministers are declared by Wilson to be guilty of treason. ('This is an act of rebellion against the Crown . . . Actions taken to give effect to it will be treasonable.') But is any step taken to arrest them? Not a hint. The law lays down with some precision what is required to be done with subjects committing acts of rebellion and treason. The law is ignored. The denunciation is purely verbal, and is obviously not intended by Wilson to be treated seriously in a legal sense, nor is it so regarded by Smith. The Governor of Rhodesia duly proclaims Smith's Government illegal. The proclamation rings round the world — everywhere except in Rhodesia. In Rhodesia it is excluded from being broadcast; the *Rhodesian Herald* is forbidden to print it. So for Rhodesia it is just some words which disappear into the air. A government cannot be displaced unless it is replaced by another government. But no other government has so far been set up by Britain. For a government to be effective requires force to maintain itself. And Britain has expressly excluded the use of force. The African national leaders have set up an alternative government (unfortunately with a rival at the moment; this has still to be sorted out). But Britain refuses to recognise it. So the public officials and citizens of Rhodesia are solemnly exhorted by Wilson to refuse to obey the illegal régime. But they are not given an alternative government to obey. For the Governor in isolation, who has not even the means to communicate with the citizens of Rhodesia, cannot function as an alternative government. The situation of a 'Governor' who cannot govern, and a non-existent 'government' which is supposed not to exist and in fact does govern, is fit only for *Alice in Wonderland*. There is about all this an unmistakable sniff of the phony war.

What Kind of Economic Sanctions?

As for the economic sanctions, all the expert financial comment has tended to stress their limitation rather than their severity.

> In imposing financial as well as trade restrictions on Rhodesia, the British Government have not gone to the ultimate extreme in either case. They have not actually frozen the London sterling balances and other assets owned on Rhodesian account, nor have they gone to the lengths of an oil embargo (*The Times*, November 12, 1965).

There are some indications that the Government is deliberately

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

holding oil sanctions in reserve as a possible trump card to play in order to defeat the demand of the African and socialist majority in the United Nations for more positive action to bring down the racialist dictatorship in Rhodesia and win the fight for African liberation. In other words, as every statement of Government spokesmen has again and again made clear, the problem is seen, not primarily in terms of defeating Rhodesian white racialism, but in terms of circumventing the African and socialist majority in the United Nations. When angry Tory questions demanded why the Foreign Secretary was being sent to call for an urgent meeting of the United Nations Security Council on Rhodesia, Wilson's answer was to say, not that this was necessary because the issue was of international concern, but 'because if we do not, somebody else will'. Heath, supporting Wilson, declared: 'The problem will be to avert excessive action by the United Nations'.

A Dubious Strategy

But will economic sanctions alone, especially of the present limited variety, or even if extended, bring down, the racialist dictatorship in Rhodesia? All experience throws doubt upon such a proposition. It is evident that the British official calculation is that the pressure of limited sanctions, with careful avoidance of any 'extreme' measures such as might bring immediate democracy with an African majority, should be sufficient to rally the 'moderate' elements among the European minority to displace the Smith Ministry by a Ministry willing to co-operate with Britain on the compromise terms already proposed, without establishing democratic rights for the African majority. This dream of British policy was already expressed long ago by the *Economist* on August 22, 1964, when it said:

> The Smith threat once averted, a new Welensky Government could be very popular in Britain . . . the whole issue of independence could simply be shelved.

Similarly *The Times* editorial on November 12, in discussing whether the economic sanctions imposed could be effective to secure 'Britain's ultimate aim' concluded that

> they can only be conducive to the aim if they are strong enough to persuade a majority of responsible Rhodesians that their leaders have made a wrong decision.

With obviously inspired parallelism of thought the *Daily Telegraph* editorial on the same day gave the same line:

> We must hope that before too long the formalities of these sanctions

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the doubt and discomfort they will cause will bring the change of heart in Rhodesia that is necessary.

It is impossible not to recognise in this strategy the parallel to the similar strategy which inspired British official policy in the period of the phony war—to avoid any extreme measures which might bring revolutionary consequences, and seek to exert only sufficient pressure to replace Hitler by a more 'moderate' German Government, possibly of Goering and the military chiefs, such as would be ready to cancel the German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact and co-operate with Britain. We know what happened to that strategy.

The Fight for African Freedom Will Go Forward

The present British official strategy in relation to Rhodesia will end in a fiasco. With the experience of the *colons* in Algeria before us, to look to the 'moderates' among the White settlers for the key rôle in displacing Smith is to indulge in a doubtful gamble for the sake of a spurious 'solution' which would still keep the African majority defranchised. This strategy means to ignore the decisive forces which are shaping the new Africa. To expect that the pressure of limited economic sanctions will rally the majority of those settlers to get rid of Smith instead of consolidating their support around him is to fly in the face of experience. To base all calculations on economic sanctions alone as a sufficient instrument, even if extended to include oil sanctions, is to ignore the rôle of South Africa, which has maintained relations with the Smith régime, and against which Britain has refused to impose economic sanctions in accordance with the recommendations of the United Nations. The question of Rhodesia cannot finally be separated from the question of South Africa and of the Portuguese colonies. The fight to end racial servitude and win democratic freedom in these territories is a common fight. Smith's action has in the end only sharpened the battle. It is a common battle of all the African peoples, as proclaimed already by all the independent African governments, with support of all the progressive peoples of the world, of the socialist nations, the newly independent states outside Africa, and of all who support these common anti-imperialist aims in the imperialist countries. No manoeuvres can sidetrack this common battle. But it is the vital interest of the British labour movement to play its full part in this common fight which is of such decisive importance for the future, not only of Africa, but of the world.

R.P.D.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PROFIT AND 'PROFITS'

Yevsei Liberman
Professor of Kharkov State University

PROFITS are the monetary form of the surplus product: that is, the product which working people produce over and above their personal needs. The surplus product is, therefore, an expression of the productivity of labour. Primitive man ate or used up what he produced. As civilisation and technology progressed, labour began to create not only the equivalent of the working people's means of subsistence but something more. This something more was the surplus product, the very same surplus product that supports the entire non-productive sphere, from the watchman to the banker and cabinet minister. But the surplus product is also the source of means essential for the development of society. That applied to feudal and capitalist society, and it applies to socialism and communism.

Under socialism products and services are also produced as commodities and also sold chiefly for money. Therefore the surplus product inevitably assumes the monetary form of profits. But since profits in our country are used in the interests of society, they become less and less an expression of surplus (unpaid) labour and come more and more to express socially necessary labour.

What is the difference between capitalist and socialist profits? The difference is not, of course, that private enterprise stands for profit while socialism 'denounces' it, as economists in the West claim.

From the private entrepreneur's point of view, all profit belongs to the capitalist. To support this view, economists built the theory of the three factors that create value: capital, land and labour. In *The Theory of Economic Development,* Joseph A. Schumpeter says that profit is everything above cost. But this 'cost' includes 'wages' for the labour of the entrepreneur, land rent, interest on capital, as well as a bonus 'for risks'. On top of that, the entrepreneur reaps a profit if he succeeds, by a new combination of production elements, in reducing the cost to below the existing price level.

What kind of 'combination of elements' this is can be seen from the fact that the main part of the profit under the private enterprise system now comes not so much from production as from the process of exchange. For instance, high profits come most readily from advantageous buying of raw materials, the raising of retail prices, the tendency of unemployment to lower wages, non-equivalent ex-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

change with developing countries, the export of capital to countries where wages are low, the system of preferential tariffs and customs duties, raising the prices of stocks on the stock exchange, and so-called *Grunder* (speculator's) profits.

All those sources of profit are ruled out in the Soviet Union owing to the very nature of socialism, under which there is neither private ownership of the means of production nor stock capital and, consequently, no stock market. The level of payment for labour depends on its productivity and is regulated by law. The prices of raw and other materials are planned; market conditions that could be taken advantage of in purchasing raw materials or hiring labour do not exist. Nor can the prices of finished articles be raised by taking advantage of market conditions. Exchange with other countries is conducted on the basis of equality and long-term agreements.

In our country profit testifies, in principle, only to the level of production efficiency. Profit is the difference between the selling price of articles and their cost. But since our prices, in principle, express the norms of expenditure of socially necessary labour, the difference is an indicator of the comparative economy with which an item is produced. Behind Soviet profits there is nothing except hours of working time, tons of raw and other materials and fuel, and kilowatt-hours of electric energy that have been saved. We do not consider profits obtained through accidental circumstances—for example, excessive prices—as a credit to the factory or other enterprise that makes it. We look on such profits, rather, as the result of an insufficiently flexible practice of price fixing. All such profits go into the state budget, without any bonus to the factory concerned.

Neither a single individual nor a single enterprise can appropriate profits in the Soviet Union. Profits are not arbitrarily invested by any persons or groups for the sake of private income. Profits belong to those to whom the means of production belong: that is, to all the citizens, to society. Profits go, first and foremost, for the planned expansion and improvement of production and scientific research, and to provide free social services for the people: education, health, pensions, scholarships. Part is spent on the management apparatus and, unfortunately, a rather large part goes for defence needs. We would gladly give up this last expenditure if a programme of general disarmament were adopted.

Our factories have been making profits in money form for more than 40 years, ever since 1921. It is with these profits that we have built up our giant industrial potential and moved to a leading

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

position in world science and technology. And we have accomplished this without major long-term credits from other countries.

Why has the question of profits been so widely discussed in the Soviet Union lately? Not because profits did not exist before and are only now being introduced: *profit was not, and still is not, used as the major over-all indicator of the efficient operation of our factories*. Besides profit, we have been using a fairly large number of obligatory indicators—among others, gross output, assortment, lower costs, number of employees, size of payroll, output per employee, and average wages. The multiplicity of indicators hamstrung the initiative of the factories. Their main concern was often to turn out as great a volume of goods as possible since they would be rated chiefly on gross output. Furthermore, factories did not pay much attention to how they used their assets. They asked for, and received free from the state, a great deal of plant which they did not always use efficiently or to full capacity.

How do we explain that? For a long time the Soviet Union was the only socialist country. We stood alone, surrounded by a world in which there were many who wanted to change our social system by force. We had to build up our own industries and secure our defences at all costs and in the shortest possible time. Such considerations as the quality and appearance of goods, or even their cost, did not count. This policy completely justified itself. The Soviet Union not only held its own in the war of 1941-45 but played the decisive rôle in saving the world from fascism. That was worth any price. And that was our 'profit' then. But, as Lenin often said, our virtues, if exaggerated, can turn into vices. And that is what happened when we held to the same administrative methods of economic management after we entered the stage of peaceful economic competition with the industrial countries of the West.

We want to give every citizen, not only the well-to-do, a high standard of living, in the intellectual as well as in the material sense. In other words, we want everyone to have the fullest opportunity to develop his mental and physical capacities and his individual (I emphasise, individual, and not group) inclinations and interests. We want every person in our country to be able to do the work he wants most to do. We want to reach the point where it will not be possible to draw a hard and fast line between a person's vocation and his avocation. But before we can bring people's intellectual capacities to full flower we must satisfy their material needs: place goods and services of high quality within everyone's reach. These needs must

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be satisfied, moreover, with the lowest possible production outlays and the fullest possible utilisation of all assets. All that cannot be done through the old methods of administrative direction and highly centralised management. We must change over to a system whereby the factories themselves have a material incentive to provide the best possible service to the consumer. It is clear that to do this we must free the factories from the excessive number of obligatory indicators. In my opinion, the criteria for rating the work of factories should be: *first*, how well they carry out their plans of deliveries (in actual products); and, if these plans are fulfilled, then *second*, their level of profitability. I believe that out of their profits, factories should have to pay into the state budget a certain percentage of the value of their assets as 'payment for use of plant'. The purpose would be to spur factories to make the most productive use of their assets. Part of the remaining share of the profits would go into incentive pay system funds, depending on the level of profitability and the rest of the profits would accrue to the state budget to finance the expansion of production and satisfy the welfare needs of the people.

Why do I choose profit as the indicator? Because profit generalises all aspects of operation, including quality of output. The prices of better articles have to be correspondingly higher than those of articles that are outmoded and not properly suited to their purpose. It is important to note, however, that profit in this case is neither the sole nor the chief aim of production. We are interested above all in products with which to meet the needs of the people and of industry. Profit is used merely as the main generalising and stimulating indicator of efficiency.

Actually, my point is to encourage factories by means of bonuses from profits, to draw up good plans. And not only to draw them up but carry them out, with encouragement from profits. It is not a question of relaxing (or rejecting) planning but, on the contrary, of improving it by drawing the factories themselves, first and foremost, into the planning process, for the factories always know their real potentialities best and should know the demands of their customers.

The contractual relations with consumers that we are now starting to introduce in several branches of light industry, by no means signify that we are going over to regulation by the market. We have better ways of predicting consumer demand because we know the wage fund of the urban population and the incomes of the collective farmers. Therefore, we can draw up scientific patterns of the population's income and expenditure. In our country consumer demand,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in terms of total volume, is a factor that lends itself to planning. However, the various elements of that volume—for instance, the colours of sweaters or the styles of suits factories should produce, or how best to organise their production—need not be the prerogatives of centralised planning but matters on which the stores and the factories concerned come to terms.

The bourgeois press admits that the Soviet people now have more money and that there is a growing demand for better and more fashionable clothing and for private cars. One would think that pointed to an improving economy, yet the Western economists claim that the switch to profits is a result of 'unsettling prospects', of 'waste, mismanagement, inefficiency and planning gone berserk'. There are, of course, instances of waste and mismanagement in the Soviet economy, just as there are in private enterprise, but in the Soviet Union we focus public attention on instances of waste and mismanagement. We publicise and criticise them openly and some Western commentators take advantage of that fact. The over-all picture shows that the Soviet Union increased its output by 7·1 per cent in 1964. It is not good enough for us, however. We are used to growth rates expressed in two digits. The reason for this relatively modest growth rate for us, was the 1963 crop failure.

We are turning to profits not because we need a 'sheet anchor'. We are not in any danger. Under socialism, profits can be a yardstick of production efficiency to a far greater degree than in the West, for in the Soviet Union profits follow, in principle, only from technological and organisational improvement. This also means that profits here will play an important but subsidiary rôle, like money in general, not the main rôle. After providing a yardstick of production achievement and a means of encouraging such achievement, profits in the Soviet Union are used wholly for the needs of society. They are returned to the population in the form of social services and expanded production, which guarantees full employment and better and easier working conditions for everyone.

In the Soviet Union nobody accumulates profits in money form—neither the state nor factories. This is an important point to grasp. If, for instance, at the end of the year the state as a whole has a surplus of budget revenue over expenditure, the surplus does not stay in the form of accumulated currency but is immediately used for two purposes: (1) to increase State Bank credits for material stocks; in other words, the surplus takes the material form of expanding inventories in production or trade, while money only

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

measures this increase, and (2) to withdraw paper money from circulation; that is, to increase the purchasing power of the rouble on the free collective farm markets, where prices are determined by supply and demand.

Consquently, profits cannot become either capital or hoarded treasure in the Soviet Union. However, profit should be an indicator of production efficiency. It should serve to encourage workers to raise their efficiency. But it should be understood that encouragement from profits is not distribution of the results of production on the basis of capital. Distribution is still on the basis of work.

The significance of profit in the Soviet Union was under-estimated owing to a certain disregard of the law of value. Some Soviet economists incorrectly interpreted that law as an unpleasant leftover from capitalism and said we had to get rid of it as quickly as possible. Shelving the law of value led to arbitrary fixing of planned prices and to prices that operated over too long a period. As a result, prices became divorced from the real value of goods, while profits fluctuated greatly from factory to factory, even on comparable articles. Under those conditions profits were a poor reflection of the actual achievements in production and, hence, were considered a poor guide in matters of economic management. This is the delusion many Soviet economists are now trying to expose. We do not intend to go back to private enterprise but, on the contrary, to permit the economic laws of socialism to operate. Centralised planning is wholly compatible with the initiative of factories.

The law of value is not a law of capitalism but a law of all commodity production, including planned commodity production under socialism. The difference from capitalism is that the goal and the means have changed places. Under capitalism, profit is the goal, and the satisfaction of the needs of the population is the means. Under socialism it is just the other way around. Satisfaction of the needs of the population is the goal, and profit is the means.

Soviet economists have no intention of testing the economic methods of private enterprise. We expect to get along with our own methods, sharpening the tried and tested instrument of material incentive on the grindstone of profit, and it will, we hope, serve socialism well. But this does not mean that we are either giving up a planned economy or turning toward the system of private enterprise. Rivers do not flow backward. And if, at high water, rivers make turns, they are simply cutting better and shorter channels for themselves. They are not looking for a way to go back.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NUCLEAR ARMS AND WEST GERMANY

Quaestor

AFTER eight weeks' discussion in the United Nations Disarmament Commission at Geneva on how to stop spreading of nuclear weapons (July 27-September 16), and over a month at New York in the Assembly's Political Committee, the latter on November 8 adopted a resolution by 83 to none, with 6 abstentions and 28 absent—a fine distinction, but it did not prevent a two-thirds majority—referring the matter back to the Disarmament Commission for 'urgent consideration'. Both the United States and the Soviet Union voted for the resolution, which said that a treaty 'should be void of loopholes which might permit nuclear or non-nuclear Powers to proliferate nuclear weapons in any form, directly or indirectly'.

But in press statements afterwards the two delegations gave their different interpretations of the word 'loopholes'. The U.S.A. continued to assert that the nuclear sharing arrangement with West Germany (within Nato) is not a loophole; whereas the Soviet Union said that such an arrangement would be a gaping hole, and would make any treaty impossible. The two States 'remain as wide apart as ever' on this point, was the justifiable comment of the *Guardian's* United Nations correspondent (November 9).

Nevertheless, it would be wrong to think that the three months of discussion were entirely wasted. For one thing, the real reason why the menace of the nuclear bomb still hangs over the world was stripped bare of all subterfuge. It is that the United States Government insisted on right of access to nuclear weapons for the ex-active Nazis who fill 15 major Ministerial posts in the West German Government, 100 posts as generals and admirals in its armed forces and 800 senior offices in its judicial system and police. Secondly, in the course of the discussions the rulers of West Germany—feeling their swiftly-growing economic and military strength, and flexing their diplomatic muscles accordingly—came out in the open with their nuclear ambitions as never before. Thirdly, the German Democratic Republic tabled proposals on August 18, and the Soviet Union a draft non-proliferation treaty on September 17, which put forward an intelligible and practical way forward to a world free of nuclear menace—and all the leading capitalist newspapers in Great Britain showed by hiding the drafts from their readers that they were afraid to challenge the Americans on this question. Last but no less signifi-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cant, the growing impudence of the leading West German politicians and militarists began visibly to arouse some qualms even among the politicians of the U.S.A., and their most loyal allies in Downing Street and elsewhere.

These various conclusions emerged gradually, and at different times. On August 14 *The Times* diplomatic correspondent said that the Western draft of a non-dissemination treaty had now 'emerged' from private talks, but still had to be discussed with other Nato governments—not West Germany, however, for it had been engaged in the talks for a fortnight already (the *Guardian* Geneva correspondent reported on August 16). Although it was based on a British formula, it contained 'an element of conscious ambiguity, at the request of West Germany'—leaving open a possibility of nuclear sharing, he added on the 17th. But by that date *The Times* diplomatic correspondent was proclaiming it 'a specifically American text', and his *Daily Telegraph* colleague at Geneva the same day was writing that it was 'a purely American draft in its key passages . . . there can be no real pretence that this is a joint Western proposal'. Evidently the Foreign Office wanted to take cover.

Nothing surprising in that. Under the draft, the signatories undertake 'not to transfer any nuclear *weapons* into the *national* control of any nuclear state, either directly or indirectly through a military alliance'—and not to take any other action which would 'cause an increase *in the total number of states and other organisations* having independent power to use nuclear weapons'. The italics are the writer's, and used deliberately. For what of transferring nuclear *knowledge, practice and experience*? What of non-nuclear states as a result becoming capable, if they withdrew from the treaty, of *making* nuclear weapons under their national control? What of Nato falling apart and its place being taken by *another* organisation—thus not increasing the total number—having independent power to use nuclear weapons, and consisting of two States: the U.S.A. and West Germany? On all this, dead silence.

Rightly, the Soviet delegate Tsarapkin asked at once: did the Western draft exclude a Nato multilateral force, or something similar, or did it not? Foster, the American delegate, was silent at the meeting, but at a later press conference the journalists forced a reply out of him: it did not. And in spite of all the efforts of the British delegation to create the impression that there was some fundamental difference between American and British ideas on the subject, it soon became clear that in this respect—whether the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bonn militarists would have access to nuclear Anglo-American know-how—they did not differ at all. As the *Observer* editorial pointed out on August 21, it would be 'wrong to read too much into the differences within the Western alliance on the American draft treaty'. They were 'tactical rather than matters of principle'. And Lord Chalfont, the Labour Government's representative, underlined this when he declared at Geneva that the Nato Powers would not accept 'total inertia' among themselves, *i.e.*, refusal to extend nuclear knowledge and participation to West Germany, as the condition for a non-proliferation treaty (*The Times* Geneva Correspondent, September 10).

These were not just lawyer's or verbal arguments, either. They reflected the hard fact that, after all the British and American efforts to wriggle out of open responsibility for the nuclear armament of West Germany, the ex-Nazis ruling that country were pressing their Anglo-Saxon friends to shoulder such responsibility, and pressing them hard.

In the September *Labour Monthly* reference was made to the entirely new phase in West German tactics opened by the sinister statement of Foreign Minister Schroeder on July 3, that 'if a form of atomic organisation can be found which will satisfy the nuclear needs of the non-nuclear Nato members . . . then West Germany would be able to abandon its demand for nuclear weapons of its own'. This was the first time that Bonn had publicly admitted to making any such demand. When the G.D.R., in February 1964, had published the text of a secret memorandum of the West German Defence Ministry, drawn up in the spring of 1963, which advanced that very demand, the capitalist press either ridiculed or ignored it. Equally important, Schroeder was insisting as the alternative that the U.S.A. and Britain should give Bonn access to *their* nuclear armaments through an 'atomic organisation' within Nato. And this point was swiftly followed up during the Geneva discussions.

On August 18, the day after Foster had tabled his draft, the *Guardian* reported from Bonn that the West German Government had made clear 'it would not sign a non-dissemination agreement without the creation beforehand of a M.L.F. or A.N.F.' (*i.e.*, of either the American or the British 'atomic organisation'). On August 19, Schmidt, defence spokesman of the Bonn Social-Democrats, in welcoming the American draft, disclaimed any desire for a voice in using the nuclear weapon. All they wanted was a part

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in 'overall strategic planning'—which might mean anything.

But on the same day Konrad Adenauer, former West German Chancellor and now chairman of the ruling Christian Democrats, made a strong attack on the American draft, saying it was a 'surrender to the Russians' and 'a tragedy for the Germans', because it meant setting up 'a club of possessors of nuclear arms'—in other words, the tragedy was that West Germany was being excluded from possessing them. Such a speech was to be expected, some time or other: it was an old form of German militarist tactics, regularly practised by Hitler in 1933-39 among others, to raise their demands immediately they secured some important concession.

Sure enough, the Presidium of the Christian Democrats on August 23 announced that 'the German problem is a tinder-box for the whole world' (*i.e.*, that there will be war if they do not get their own way). And what is their own way? Here they became conveniently vague: West Germany 'cannot be denied *an appropriate voice* in the question of nuclear weapons'. But all the same they were emphatic that 'it is unacceptable for there to be in Nato two classes of members with different rights'—*i.e.*, one class which possesses nuclear bombs, and one which does not.

As in Hitler's day too, this unaccustomed roar startled some of Bonn's best friends. The tone from Bonn had 'changed drastically' wrote the amazed correspondent of the *Guardian* (August 24). The West Germans had 'suddenly put up their price', lamented the *Telegraph's* reporter (August 25). But just to clinch matters, the Christian Democrat's 'wild man', handy to blurt out things they do not always find it convenient to spell out in full—Franz Josef Strauss, leader of their Bavarian wing and former Defence Minister —confirmed it all in a leading newspaper, the *Rheinische Merkur* (August 26). It was a 'nightmare' that Germany, 'the third greatest economic power in the world' was being forced once again to accept 'a kind of "military Versailles" ' (up come once again the floods of hypocritical self-pity of the defeated German imperialists and their hordes of deluded philistines, as Marx used to call them!). But if this did happen then 'a new Fuhrer type would promise to acquire nuclear weapons or worse—and get them'.

Thus things have got quite close to the stage of which this journal has given warning for many months—that, encouraged step by step in rearmament, anti-Sovietism, suppression of the peace movement and the Communist Party by their American and British patrons (Republican and Democrat, Tory and right-wing Labour),

(Continued on p 554

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VIETNAM M

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OTHER

y R. Bondzim (*From the 'Artists Against Racialism' Exhibition*)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the kings of West German monopoly capitalism would keep up their oily professions of peacefulness only so long as they felt it was politic to do so. But as soon as they felt their old economic strength returned ('the third greatest economic power in the world') and the old blood-and-iron spirit coursing through their veins ('a tinder box for the whole world'), they would throw off the mask—and indeed must do so, as a fully-fledged monopoly capitalist, imperialist State once more (for the *third* time in history!). They have now begun the process (as these lines are being written, comes the news of Chancellor Erhard's wail in Parliament, so familiar from Hitler's times, about the 'danger from the East' and the 'injustices' inflicted on poor defenceless West Germany).

Now there is also a series of forced admissions from those who were their warmest champions. Listen to the *Economist* (August 28) 'For the first time since the war, a conservative group speaks out undisguisedly for the defence of German national interests' (*i.e.*, for the military demands of reborn German imperialism). 'In many ways this is a natural phenomenon, a sign of recovery from 1945' (a recovery carefully nurtured and cherished, great trusts, Junkers, militarists and all, by the rulers of Britain and the U.S.A., in their besotted hatred of the Soviet Union, the *Economist* forgot to add). Listen to the *Daily Telegraph* editorial (October 13) admitting out loud what the *Labour Monthly* has said all along, that it is not mainly a question of American or Nato bombs: 'If any Power were able to construct a nuclear bomb without outside aid, it would be Germany'. Listen to James Reston in another famous cold war mouthpiece the *New York Times* (October 15), admitting that West Germany itself is able to 'develop nuclear weapons'. Listen to the diplomatic correspondent of another anti-Soviet trumpet, the *Guardian*, explaining (October 21) the danger that West Germany 'may seek its own nuclear weapon, if not given participation in a multilateral nuclear force or an Atlantic Nuclear Force'.

The new element in these statements, of course, is not the naïve suggestion that West Germany's entry into a M.L.F. or A.N.F. will in some way prevent it getting its own nuclear bombs. That fallacy is as old as 1952-54, when approval of German rearmament under Nato 'control' was railroaded through the British T.U.C. and Labour Party conference by shameless trickery and defiance of trade union conference decisions and through the British and French Parliaments by minority votes. It has led today to West Germany, with 440,000 armed men in 12 armoured or mechanised divisions

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and a 'Frontier Guard', backed by 700,000 trained reserves, with 2,300 modern tanks, 1,000 warplanes, 280 warships in 22 squadrons, 70 major rocket launching emplacements, 220 anti-aircraft rocket launchers, nuclear works under construction capable of producing some 70 nuclear bombs a year, becoming by far the strongest military force in capitalist Europe—with a ready-made 'territorial' general staff of its own (contrary to all pledges) on the day it decides to take its legions out of Nato.

No, the new element is precisely the admission that economically—in terms of iron and steel, chemicals and engineering, a network of nuclear research and testing stations—West German monopoly capitalism can now build its own bombs. For this admission exposes what a swindle—and a murderous one, in the full sense of the word—the M.L.F., A.N.F., or any such scheme is. Instead of their imaginary 'control' of West German nuclear armament, they would supply invaluable know-how, training, concentrated experience, and so *speed up* such armament.

There are some signs that these hard facts are beginning to make a first dim impression within Nato itself. Not on the State Department, of course. It 'remains inflexibly opposed to a non-proliferation treaty if it excludes nuclear arrangements such as the M.L.F.', reported *The Times* Washington correspondent on October 12: it will not allow anything to affect its relations with West Germany, which has 'the greatest strategic value, the largest army committed to Nato, a booming economy that is the admiration of most Americans, and impatient political elements which must be appeased', he continued next day. These two texts themselves would make an excellent study-subject for disentanglement and explanation in any current affairs class, trade union branch, local Labour Party or Communist Party branch.

The first small symptoms of doubt have appeared, all the same. Mr. Stewart caused an instant uproar in Bonn by venturing the suggestion, at the United Nations Assembly on October 7, that an agreement to prevent nuclear dissemination might deserve first priority after all, and that the question might be 'considered' as to how far the M.L.F. or A.N.F. might be an 'obstacle to a major advance in agreement with Eastern Europe'—a point he repeated three days later in a television interview (*Guardian*, October 11) and on which he was supported in the U.S. Senate by Robert Kennedy (*The Times*, October 14). *The Times* again, in an editorial on October 27, gave its backing to a suggestion coming from one section of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American military opinion, headed by Defence Secretary Macnamara, that West Germany might be given a seat on a Nato nuclear 'planning committee' rather than a share in a mixed nuclear force—and thus be edged a little further away from the bombs themselves (though by November 7 the *Sunday Times* Washington correspondent was reporting that, owing to West German opposition, this scheme was already 'beginning to peter out'). The French Government has for long been against both M.L.F. or A.N.F.—and on November 5 the *Guardian's* Bonn correspondent reported Gerstenmaier, President of the West German Parliament, as saying at a press dinner that he doubted if the M.L.F. was worth the price of spoiling friendship between France and West Germany; while its United Nations correspondent repeated a rumour that U.S. Under-Secretary of State, Ball, hitherto 'strong' on the M.L.F., had become doubtful about it.

Thus so far there have been only slight and not very substantial hints of a possible change in atmosphere, which it would take the most vigorous and unrelenting pressure outside and inside the House of Commons to make a reality. Nothing has appeared in the West comparable to the memorandum of the German Democratic Republic on August 10, repeating an offer already made to West Germany—that the two German States should renounce the production, acquisition and use of nuclear weapons, or control over them in any form: and should participate in the formation of an atom-free zone in Central Europe (which the Labour Party is pledged to, by conference decision, of course).

Still less has there been any parallel to the Soviet draft treaty introduced by Gromyko at the United Nations Assembly on September 24 (and not published by the British capitalist press, as noted earlier).

This draft proposes, in its very first article:

> 1. The parties to the treaty who possess nuclear weapons agree not to place such weapons by any means whatsoever—either directly, or indirectly by the agency of third states or groups of states—in the possession or at the disposal of states or groups of states who do not possess nuclear weapons, and agree not to accord the said states or groups of states the right to participate in the possession, disposal or use of nuclear weapons.
>
> The aforementioned parties will not provide nuclear weapons or accord the right of control over them, over their location or use, to the units of armed forces or to individual servicemen of states which do not possess nuclear weapons, even if these units or servicemen are under the command of some kind of military alliance.
>
> 2. The parties to this treaty who possess nuclear weapons agree not to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

assist directly or indirectly by the agency of third states or groups of states, such states as do not at present possess nuclear weapons, in the production, or the preparation of the production, or the testing of such weapons, and agree not to pass on any industrial, scientific, research or other information or documentation which could be employed in the production or use of nuclear weapons.

The second article provides parallel foolproof obligations for non-nuclear States.

It is surely not an exaggeration to say that any treaty failing to reproduce the *essentials* of this draft is no real protection against the spreading of nuclear weapons, and therefore against the menace of a nuclear war of revenge launched by the Nazi-ridden government of West Germany. That must inexorably be the conclusion, not so much from the terms of the Soviet draft as from the unusually revealing proceedings at the United Nations and at Geneva between July and November. And smooth assurances put into the Queen's Speech on November 9, promising to 'seek the conclusion of a treaty to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons', will be nothing but a common swindle if at the same time the Labour Government in practice goes on backing the American policy and opposing such a plain closing of loopholes as provided in the Soviet draft.

LABOUR MONTHLY FORTY YEARS AGO

Sharp on the heels of Liverpool (Labour Party Conference, 1925) has followed the Government's attack. The Government's attack has carried out the course predicted with exactitude. First, the concentration on the revolutionary wing, by the prosecution of the Communist Party. Second, the extension to a wider field of the whole Labour Press, by the Government's dropping of the case against the gunmen who seized the *Daily Herald* van. Third, the extension to the whole trade union field, by the renewed Conservative taking up of the Political Levy Bill (though this will probably have to wait on the success of the economic offensive). Finally, the preparation of the economic offensive, which is being organised more and more openly and with more and more open co-operation between the Government and fascism. It is clear that Liverpool has not ended the class struggle by its resolutions of trustful faith in capitalist democracy, nor has it conciliated the bourgeoisie by its obedient surrender of working-class unity in response to the imperious clamour of the capitalist Press. On the contrary, Liverpool has only encouraged the Government to attack.

(From 'Notes of the Month', *Labour Monthly*, December 1925.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE GREAT TRAINMEN'S ROBBERY

Robert Bonnar

Executive Committee Member, National Union of Railwaymen

IT is a long time since British engineers built the world's first locomotive and laid the very first length of track. Since then, it has been our proud contention that railways in this country have remained the best and safest in the world. We on the trade union side within the industry have always jealously guarded this fine reputation; always argued for still better safety standards for both our members and the travelling public.

Now we are worried. The recent signing of the agreement on productivity payments for Footplate Staff makes us afraid of what the future might hold. In return for these payments the British Railways Board and the Government have demanded their pound of flesh and, like Shylock, they want it from near the heart.

Piecework on the footplate is not completely new to our railway industry. On the freight side it has operated in different parts of the country and in a very limited way for many years. As far back as 1949, and again in 1953, as a result of pressure from the unions, the former Railway Executive gave an undertaking that they would gradually withdraw these schemes until all trains had been eliminated from bonus working. They never honoured that undertaking and in 1960 they told the unions that these schemes were not being withdrawn after all; that the policy of the new Railway Management was different from that of the old Railway Executive. They had gained a foothold and they meant to keep it.

Then in 1961, when great difficulty was being experienced in keeping freight traffic on the move throughout the Midlands, mainly due to staff shortages, they seized the opportunity to extend these schemes. Discussions took place and after the unions had been assured that no redundancy would be declared they agreed to new schemes being introduced on an experimental basis. The outcome was that certain men, on certain trains, at a few selected depots, became embraced in a scheme for bonus payments. All the rest of the men were pawns. To make matters worse, more and more bonus schemes were being introduced for grades other than those in the footplate line of promotion with the inevitable result that the principles accepted by the Guillebaud Report were becoming quite farcical.

Railway grades in the lower paid wage groups were beginning to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

earn more wages than engine drivers and top-class signalmen who were in the highest wage groups, and for the same number of hours. The situation was made even more anomalous when some drivers were forced to come off the main line because of a deterioration in either their health or their eyesight, and on being accommodated on a shunting engine in a yard where there happened to be a bonus scheme, they found themselves earning considerably more money than they had ever been able to earn on main line trains.

Something had to be done. The footplate grades in both unions began to feel restive and disgruntled. A national bonus scheme for trainmen was sought. Negotiations were opened with the Board but little or no progress was made. The reason for this was the adamant attitude of the Board that any payments they were prepared to offer must be related to increased productivity which, they insisted, could only be brought about by a radical revision of a Manning Agreement which was signed only eight years ago. Provision was made in the 1957 Manning Agreement for all trains hauled by diesel and electric locomotives, which were not fitted throughout with automatic brakes, to be double-manned. Such trains as well as multiple unit trains, had also to be double-manned where the duration of a driver's rostered turn was more than eight hours, or where the scheduled train running was more than 200 miles or six hours per turn of duty, or where the scheduled non-stop distance between two points was more than 100 miles or more than two hours running time. It also provided for trains being double-manned between 12 midnight and 6 a.m., unless such trains were scheduled to finish before 1 a.m. or commence not before 5 a.m., and for all drivers working single-manned to be given a clear break of 30 minutes between the third and fifth hours of duty for physical needs.

While the rapidly dwindling complement of steam engines which are still in the industry would essentially remain double-manned, the Board were seeking to eliminate the post of second man at almost all times on nearly every form of diesel and electric traction. The declared policy of both unions was against any revision of the 1957 Manning Agreement, against any extension of single-manning. While meetings of a Sub-Committee, set up by the Railway Staff National Council, were in session, the Executive Committee of the N.U.R. reaffirmed this policy, and so did the Annual Assembly of Delegates of A.S.L.E.F., last June by an 8 to 1 majority.

A few weeks later, the drivers on a district on the Southern Region, incensed and disgruntled by the trend of events, decided to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

work to rule. This gave the issue an increased sense of urgency. Further meetings were arranged. But the Board refused to budge: any productivity payment on a national scale must be related to a complete revision of the 1957 Manning Agreement. The unions claimed they had presented a powerful case for payments to be made on past and current contributions to increased productivity. The Board could not refute this. Because of the very much higher degree of utility diesel and electric traction has over its steam counterparts, a lot less men in recent years have been doing a lot more work. When the 1957 Manning Agreement was signed, there were more than 83,000 footplatemen in the industry. Now there are less than 50,000.

During the last few years alone the number of drivers has been reduced from over 34,000 to nearly 30,000, and the number of firemen and cleaners from nearly 29,000 to around 19,000. The main factor in these reductions has been the displacement of steam by diesel and electric traction. As it is reckoned that within the next two years steam traction will have been completely displaced, still further sharp reductions are in the offing. On top of this, we are right in the thick of an unprecedented retirement bulge. Those men who came into the industry in large numbers in 1919 when we won the 8-hours day are now going out, and from the present complement of 30,000 drivers, 11,000 are due to leave during the next five years on reaching normal retirement age. Such a figure in itself creates a huge problem, but the actual figure, as a result of wastage, will be very much higher. Yet in full knowledge of how desperate the staff position on the footplate was bound to become, the Board, in most districts, have a policy of strictly controlled recruitment.

It should be noted that when the rise in working deficits was reversed in 1963 by an improvement of £22 million (a trend which was continued last year), most of this saving was due to the reduced cost of train working; the more productive use of locomotives, carriages and wagons. It must also be noted that as most men on the footplate were already being worked to capacity (particularly on the passenger side and in places such as the Southern Region, where feelings were demonstrated in a positive manner) there was no scope within the existing agreement to make them do more.

Up until this time drivers received a mileage payment of 6d. for every 15 miles they worked a train over a distance of 65 miles up to 139 miles, then for every 15 miles over 140 miles they were paid an additional hour's wages. After a whole series of meetings and the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

threat of more working to rule by the drivers on the Southern Region, with increasing agitation for a national work to rule, the Board offered to pay a productivity payment of 40 minutes to all drivers from 0 to 65 miles, up to 100 minutes from 105 to 124 miles, and then to start slightly improved 'long-distance' mileage payments at 125 instead of 140 miles. This gave a minimum payment to every driver of around 26s. a week.

While these payments were being made to all drivers, schemes were to be devised for shed, shunt and trip-freight drivers based on a measured amount of work done. Safeguards were also offered to men made surplus, such as firemen being given a guarantee of earnings and an assurance that they would be 'carried' until absorbed by attrition. With unrest among the footplate grades now at its height, the hooks were heavily baited with all sorts of inducements. What had been offered went a long way towards meeting what the unions had been claiming. The men on the job were told what had been offered, by the Board, and to most drivers it meant a few more pounds a week. But what the men had not been told in the document circulated by the Board was the extortionate price being demanded in return for these payments.

The Board demanded that the scheduled train running single-manned for each turn of duty should have the limit increased from 200 to 350 miles for express passenger, parcels and fish trains, from 150 to 250 miles for stopping passenger and express freight trains and even in the case of heavy loose-coupled mineral trains, which have always been double-manned, they demanded the withdrawal of the second man where the scheduled train running was not more than 100 miles. With equal disregard for safety, they have also demanded that all trains during night hours must be manned in the same way as during daytime hours; that the 8-hour roster must be relaxed; and so must the arrangement under which drivers on single-manned turns were rostered to have a clear 30 minutes break between the third and fifth hours for physical needs. While still in negotiation on the issue with the Board, seeking, in the interests of safety, that the Board should modify its demands, the unions were suddenly informed that under the Industrial Courts Act, 1919, the Minister of Labour had set up a Court of Inquiry, consisting of A. J. Scamp, Esquire, J.P., because a trade dispute existed between the British Railways Board 'and members of the Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen'.

Strangely enough no dispute existed between the Board and the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unions as we were still in negotiation, but it was only the Board and the unions who were invited to appear before the Court of Inquiry. We never asked for such an Inquiry and there is some mystery as to who did. But it may be significant that those members of the A.S.L.E.F. who were said to be in dispute with the Board were never invited to put their case.

The outcome of the Scamp Inquiry has enabled the Board to bring off the biggest coup the industry has ever known, at the expense of the footplatemen, and by what must be a dangerous lowering of safety standards. The Board have had their pound of flesh and time will tell how much blood is to be shed. On almost every form of diesel and electric traction the second man's position has been nearly wiped out. On posts eliminated alone, claimed to be around 12,500 in the next few years, they will save something like £13 million. Once schemes have been conceived for shed and trip-freight drivers, that figure will be considerably increased. It is estimated that the cost of the productivity payments will be just over £3 million.

Many of us fear that there will be a sharp increase in the accident rate in the years immediately ahead. We also fear that the signing of this agreement will create a lot more problems and anomalies within the industry than those it was designed to resolve.

CONFERENCE OF AFRICAN STATES

Jane Bukari

THE determined and fierce pressures which imperialism is exerting on the newly independent states in Africa, were clearly to be seen in the campaign which preceded the holding of the recent meeting of the Heads of States of Independent African States, in Accra last month.

Every effort was made to prevent the holding of the Conference. Press campaigns were mounted, especially against Ghana, well known as a leading advocate of African unity. Allegations were made that Ghana was harbouring refugees who were organising to carry out subversive activities in neighbouring states. Another line of attack was to pour scorn on the possibility of any positive achievements coming out of the Conference. So fierce did the campaign

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

become that the mere fact of holding the Conference at all in Accra, became in itself an anti-imperialist success. Efforts were made to arouse narrow nationalist sentiment by suggesting that the call for Continental Union Government is a device to satisfy the overweening political ambition of one or other of the Heads of State. A number of former French colonies, unfortunately submitted to imperialist pressures, but in spite of all the efforts to prevent it, the Conference took place with 28 States represented, most of them by their Heads of State.

The growth of Continental Unity is seen by the people of Africa as indispensable to them in their continued, unremitting fight against imperialism. Those who work so hard for their unity are not unaware of the many difficulties that lie ahead for them, but they are acutely aware of the yet more serious problems that will face them if they are disunited. They know that the artificial splitting up of the Continent into small states with weak economies and small internal markets, places them at the mercy of imperialism which continuously threatens their real independence. It is through unity that they see the possibility of mobilising sufficient political and economic strength to resist neo-colonialism. The resistance to neo-colonialism has to go on at the same time as the task of ridding the continent once and for all of colonialism and racialist régimes.

The Rhodesian crisis dominated the Accra Conference. It was a constant reminder that the initial impulse for unity is an anti-imperialist one. The dangers and complexities of the crisis emphasised the magnitude of the task of liberating Southern Africa from the rule of Rhodesian white settlers, from the Portuguese Fascists and from South Africa's apartheid régime. The discussions on the Rhodesian crisis occupied the bulk of the time of the Conference. The resolution which was passed was not reached without difficulty.

Two years ago, the O.A.U. established what is known as the Committee of Nine, to co-ordinate assistance to the national liberation movements in Africa. M. Diallo Telli, the Secretary General of the O.A.U. was extremely critical of the work of the Committee, which has not yet succeeded in unifying the various sections of the movements, nor has it yet found effective methods of transmitting aid to them. This remains one of the most serious challenges to the Organisation.

The representatives of ZAPU and ZANU were present in Accra during the Conference and a special sub-Committee was set up to try and reconcile them. It is tragic that they were unable to report

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any success, and the two parties remain divided. In spite of these problems, however, the Conference faced up to its responsibilities. The Secretary-General set the dominant note when he declared in his report, that the situation in Rhodesia is explosive and a threat to world peace, but that the British Government has carried out a policy 'in flagrant contradiction to her moral, political and constitutional obligations, but also with her well established principles, as displayed in Guyana and Aden, where she did not hesitate, in face of an infinitely less dangerous situation than that which exists now in Rhodesia, to recall Governments which nevertheless had popular support. under the false pretext that her interests were no longer safe and that her responsibilities as a colonial power made it her duty to keep order and security'. The section on Rhodesia ends with the following declaration:

> The extreme seriousness of the situation in Southern Rhodesia and the challenge which it constitutes for the O.A.U. for the achievement of all its liberation aims for the African continent lead the Secretariat to suggest that absolute priority should be given to the situation by the Council in order that the necessary decisions are taken at the proper time.

The Heads of State were not in the least distracted from the central political issue for Rhodesia. In spite of all the attempts to present the main aim as being to stop the unilateral declaration of independence by the white settlers, they cut through this with the demand at the very opening of their Resolution for majority government in Southern Rhodesia.

This is the key demand for which they adopted a resolution directed to the United Nations. Its main features were as follows: Britain should suspend the 1961 Constitution and take over the administration of the territory, if necessary using armed force to do so. There follows the insistence on the release of Joshua Nkomo and the Reverend N. Sithole from imprisonment or detention and all other political prisoners. This is the necessary precondition to the insistence on the holding of a constitutional conference with representatives of the entire population of Rhodesia, to adopt a constitution constructed on the principle of one man one vote, free elections and independence.

With these demands firmly established as the central strategy, the Heads of State went on to consider forms of pressure which could be applied for their realisation. All African States are now committed to the non-recognition of any white minority government in Rhodesia and to extending recognition to a national government in exile if the settlers succeed in the unilateral declaration. The

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

O.A.U. members were further urged to reconsider their own relations with Britain if she grants or tolerates independence of the white minority régime, both diplomatic and economic.

The Africa Group at the United Nations was empowerd to push for the fullest discussion of this resolution in the United Nations, and all African States were urged to give the maximum assistance to the people of Zimbabwe to win their independence. These proposals are of far-reaching character and that section of the resolution which calls for sanctions against Britain in the event of her tolerating a unilateral settler declaration would have a tremendous effect, not only on Britain but on the African states which are in the Commonwealth, because of the extensive ramifications of their economic relations with Britain.

Undeterred by these problems, President Nkrumah expressed the spirit of the O.A.U. Resolution completely when he met Wilson during the latter's two-hour stop down in Accra en route from Salisbury.

In a prepared statement, President Nkrumah outlined the main sections of this resolution and declared that if white minority rule is established and if the Queen remains the Head of such a state in Southern Rhodesia, then Ghana will withdraw from the Commonwealth. Wilson was considerably rattled both by the uncompromising nature of the statement and by the demonstration from the Ghanaian crowd at the airport with placards and slogans expressive of the O.A.U. Resolution.

To opinion in Africa, it seems incredible that the British Government is prepared, after such a resolution by the African Heads of State, to continue to alienate African opinion through appeasement of Smith's racist régime. The feeling on Rhodesia is not one generated from above by Governments, it reflects the deep rooted hatred of the African masses for imperialism and racism. Not only will Britain be judged by what happens now in Rhodesia, there are few remaining illusions about the imperialist sympathies of the present Labour Government, but African Governments too will be judged by their people, and they will be rejected if they fail to live up to the spirit and letter of the Resolution which can be a powerful weapon in helping to unify all the forces working for independence within the country and all those outside whose assistance and whose pressure can force real victory.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INCORRIGIBLE WARMONGERS

D. N. Pritt

THE real rulers of Western Germany today are the great combines of I. G. Farben, Flick, Thyssen, Siemens, Krupp, A.E.G., and others, all of which the British and Americans agreed at Potsdam to break up, and all of which the Americans have since rebuilt, financed, encouraged, and refused to break up. They are largely the same organisations, and have the same policies and ambitions, as the rulers of all Germany, who in 1908 onwards, and again in 1933 onwards, plotted the first and second world wars. They are now plotting the third world war, for their same old purposes—to increase their own wealth and power and to extend the territories of their country by force of arms.

We are reminded of this by the *Brown Book of War- and Nazi-Criminals in the Federal Republic* recently published (in German and English) in the German Democratic Republic and at the same time it gives us other equally important information.

Primarily, this admirably compiled and fully documented book exposes some 1,800 seriously incriminated Nazis, many of them actually war-criminals, who today hold high office in West Germany in the most vital fields of public activity—the government, the administration, the armed forces, the diplomatic service, the machinery of justice, the police, the economy, science and the organs of publicity; fifteen of them are ministers or—even more important—state secretaries, 100 of them are generals and admirals (not to mention several who sit at the top of Nato), 828 of them hold high judicial office, 245 are high civil servants, 297 are high police officers, with quite a few in the equivalent of our 'Special Branch', oddly named the 'Office for the protection of the Constitution'—that constitution which the said rulers are now trying to tear to pieces because it presents some obstacles to their plans for suppressing public opinion and establishing a dictatorship; and, to round it off, there are 520 in the Foreign Office at Bonn, with 60 Ambassadors or persons holding Ambassador's rank. These Nazis are not just nominal members of the Nazi Party, but are deeply implicated, on their feet or at their desks, in the dreadful guilt of a decade of wholesale murder and ill-treatment of Communists, Socialists, trade unionists, Jews, slave-labourers, Russians, Poles Czechoslovaks, and other categories of persons unwelcome to Nazis.

The book catalogues these unforgiveable brutes clearly and in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

detail; but it is far more than a catalogue. It contains a series of articles on the rulers of Hitler Germany and of West Germany, on the Gestapo, the S.S., and the S.D., on the presence of Nazis in the armed forces and in the government of today, and on the plans and the extensive propaganda, on which tens of millions of pounds are being spent every year—there are, be it noted, 127 central organisations of revanchists and 100 neo-Nazi publishing houses turning out 20,000,000 pamphlets a year—for the seizure by armed force of all the territories which Hitler Germany held in 1937, *i.e.*, of the whole of the German Democratic Republic and substantial territories of the U.S.S.R., Poland and Czechoslovakia.

The book is also important in that it shows the true reason why the rulers obstinately retain all these Nazis in office, with knowledge of their pasts—for the German Democratic Republic makes sure that they and the world public have full information on the matter—and dismiss them only slowly, reluctantly, one by one, and generally with substantial pensions, when public opinion in the world, and so far as it is not stifled in West Germany itself, grows too strong to resist. These criminal elements are not retained just because they are 'efficient and experienced, nor to win the votes of the numerous neo-Nazi electors, nor even to 'let (Nazi) bygones be bygones', but because these Nazis are not bygones but something terribly not 'by' and not 'gone'. The real reason is that the incorrigible and incurable—but not undefeatable—rulers, with the same policies they have held ever since they came into existence with the growth of German industrial power, naturally turn in the 'sixties to the thugs and propagandists and armchair murderers whom they used under that Hitler whom they selected, financed, and installed in power; they use them because they and they alone have in full measure the ruthlessness and the evil single-mindedness needed for the foul purposes of these rulers. As the writers observe, the refusal to get rid of the Nazis is an essential part of the policy of reversing the results of the second world war. Neither the rulers nor their Nazi hirelings have changed in the least, except in the sense that the modern weapons of war they seek to use are more terrible than the older ones; what has changed, fortunately for life on earth, is that one third of Germany, the German Democratic Republic, now stands firmly for peace, that the Socialist world is now far stronger, and that the forces working for peace in the capitalist world are also stronger than they were.

An additional sinister feature of West Germany, disclosed in the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

book, is that the rulers are now engaged in forcing through the legislature a series of 'emergency laws', a close parallel to the 'enabling laws' passed under Hitler and intended for the same purpose, namely to give some cover of legality to the establishment of a dictatorship and the launching of aggresive war.

The whole picture is a horrible one; one sees clearly that, as before, the vast and powerful combines are determined on war as essential to their mad—should I say 'mad' or just 'capitalist'?—pursuit of profit and power; and one sees how concentrated capital makes war almost inevitable so long as it retains power. What terrible guilt, too, must the capitalist rulers of the U.S.A. and Great Britain carry for having reinstated their brothers the West German capitalist rulers in power, in the teeth of their Potsdam promises, for the second time in one generation, out of their blind fear of the advances of Socialism.

The position is desperately dangerous; indeed, it is not difficult to believe the many reports that the West German rulers, already in possession of the strongest land army of the Western world, are actually increasing their efficiency and readiness, are stationing more and more front-line troops on the frontiers of the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia, and are boasting that they will be ready to attack in 1967.

British public opinion must be roused to force our government to act; we must at the very least compel it to reject any form of nuclear armament for West Germany, to leave Nato or at the minimum insist on its fundamental modification, and to recognise the German Democratic Republic, the one German state which accepts and fulfils the Potsdam agreement and pursues a policy of peace, in illuminating contrast to West Germany. This recognition would greatly improve the whole position in Europe, and would destroy the already weakened Hallstein doctrine, whereby the world is insolently invited to treat the Bonn warmongers as the sole representatives in the world of the German people, and to regard the only peaceable German state that has ever existed as a pariah. If we do not succeed in making our government change its policy, there is a real danger that, in spite of the strength of the peace forces in the world, the gangsters of the Ruhr will start the third world war.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOK REVIEWS

Success and Failure of Picasso
John Berger
Penguin Books. 206 pp. 12s. 6d.

DO WE RISE TO the challenge of dialectical thinking on art when—oh so rarely—we have the opportunity to encounter it? The progressive reader can answer this for himself now. In fact, he must. John Berger's *Success and Failure of Picasso* brings that challenge and stimulus to his door.

John Berger has said that he wrote this book out of a profound respect for the man and artist; that this respect made it worthwhile to try to understand Picasso's dilemma. On television (B.B.C.1 on an October Sunday) he distilled that respect into a power to bring the viewer close to his findings, very close to Picasso: a new experience, as this book is a new experience, because he refracted all his own life's analysis into a beam with which to perceive Picasso in his own life and time.

In this compellingly and absorbing book, perception and analysis is fully developed. I shall try to give a sense of Berger's challenges. 'He is the most famous painter in the world and his fame rests upon his modernity. He is the undisputed emperor of modern art. And yet in his attitude to art and his own destiny as an artist there is a bias which is not in the least modern and which belongs more properly to the beginning of the nineteenth century. Furthermore there seems to be a connection between his historical ambiguity and the nature and scale of his success.' Berger examines the separateness of Picasso as a Spaniard. He shows the essence of his nationality operating through his life. He shows the way in which the success and honour from 1917 on, offered Picasso by bourgeois society, has prevented the expanding operation in this great man's work of that creative law (truer and truer as the life, politics, arts of this century move on or back)—the necessity to move through the national to the international.

An extension of Berger's thesis—'We can see very precisely how the success from which he has suffered has harmed him. It would be quite wrong to say that Picasso has lost his personal integrity—on the contrary he has remained obstinately true to his original self.

The harm done is that he has been prevented from developing. And this has happened because he has been deprived of contact with modern reality . . . Picasso has been assimilated into European bourgeois society—and this society is now essentially unreal.'

A far-reaching and passionate sense of process illuminates the whole book; process in Berger's overall 'control', presentation of the realities of the twentieth century through which Picasso has worked. In particular, of the revolution in scientific thinking at the beginning of the century to which the seminal discoveries of the Cubists relate. In this great innovation in pictorial and sculptural space and structure relationships, Picasso strove—for the only time in his working life closely with a group, all searching—and was changed himself.

For Picasso, Berger says—'It was a period of great excitements, but also a period of inner certainty and security. It was, I believe, the only time when Picasso felt entirely at home. It is from that period, as much as from Spain, that he has since been exiled.' Berger's detailed analysis of how this group of painters in Paris found the way to 'paint the good omens of the modern world' is a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

living hub of this book, and to what followed for Picasso when 1914 dispersed the group and Picasso was once again alone—alone after the war, in an essentially political world.

Berger's penetration in depth of Picasso's motive forces through the second peak period of his paintings of Marie Therèse and of Guernica in the '30s, to his tragic series of drawings of Painter and Model in 1953 is, in itself, a new power which the discoveries of the twentieth century within man himself have made possible. All Berger's own experience, thought and power to discover have gone to make this book. It is richly documented with pictorial reproductions. Those who move with our times really must read and possess it.

BARBARA NIVEN.

Education and the Labour Movement, 1870-1920
Brian Simon
Lawrence & Wishart. 388 pp. 50s.

AS A NEW STAGE opens in the battle for a comprehensive educational system, embodying the traditional socialist aims of free, full and equal education for all, it is essential to understand how the present inadequate and class-divided system was constructed. Brian Simon, in the second of his scholarly, readable and splendidly illustrated *Studies in the History of Education* shows the changes of this crucial period (1870-1920) to have been not the 'continuous upward curve of development', which they are sometimes represented to be, but 'the outcome of battles fought amid much noise and dust'. In these battles the aim of those contestants who held political power was to maintain and strengthen capitalist society while, broadly speaking, the labour movement campaigned for an educational system which would be both part of and a means towards a socialist transformation of society.

The Balfour Act, of 1902, was a decisive victory for reaction, ending the progressive work towards democratic control and universal secondary education undertaken by the Schools Boards and increasing the influence of the Church of England in the system. It was capped by the works of R. L. Morant at the Board of Education, which systematically developed secondary education as a middle-class preserve, separate from and parallel with the restricted elementary education allowed to the working-class and modelled on the traditions of the Public Schools, with only a hard and narrow path into this preserve for the few exceptional working-class children. The pattern of the next half-century was set; for, in spite of all the grand promises of Lloyd George in World War I, the Fisher Act of 1918 was—in the words of the W.E.A. at the time—little more than an act for ending the half-time education system to which working-class children had been subjected. British education was to sink gradually into the slough under the twin weights of class-distinction and classics-bound curricula.

Brian Simon shows, with much fascinating detail, the conflicts which preceded the 1902 Act. The Radical and Socialist upsurge of the 1870s-90s created a mass of educational organisations from the branches of the Social Democratic Federation, Socialist League and the National Secular Society to the Socialist Sunday Schools and the Clarion Scouts. These not only educated a generation of militants but also campaigned for conditions of leisure and health which would make education for all a possible reality. In so doing they were inspired by William Morris's vision of the 'Educative Society' (The

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

author's summary of Morris's ideas on work and education is excellent).

The educational aims of the militant New Unionism were stated by Thomas Smyth of the London Trades Council, to the Cross Commission in 1887: improvement of the School Boards, education, secular and free from elementary school to university, financed by the National Exchequer and the 'use of endowments filched from the poor', with good conditions for teachers. His programme was branded as 'pure communism' by members of the Commission.

On the other side in the battle were those who sought, for philanthropic or political reasons, to reconcile the working class to their position in society and to educate an elite to govern. By 1900 the Public Schools had been reformed to train rulers while the workers were taught not even the elements needed for modern industry'. Such 'education' being supplemented by the Boys' Brigade and so forth.

In the event it was the Conservatives, aided by the Fabians, who triumphed in 1902 to the disgust of even non-conformist Liberals, who objected to the religious bias of the Act. The labour movement had not only to return to the fight for free and comprehensive education, but even such minor reforms as permission to councils to give school meals and medical inspections had to be wrested from a ruling class as mean as it was rich. By 1918 the aim of comprehensive education was already undermined in the labour movement by the call for different types of secondary schools, suited to different abilities.

The chapter on 'Developments and Conflicts in Adult Education 1900-1920' is one of the best short accounts written on this subject, recounting the work of Marxist teachers, such as John Maclean and Tom Bell, as well as the more often told stories of the founding of the Workers Educational Association, the Ruskin strike and the campaigns of the Plebs League. Brian Simon shows, for instance, how the W.E.A. itself was the child both of those who wanted the social emancipation of the workers and those who pointed to individual education as the means of 'rising above' material struggles, while, in the other camp, the Marxist content of Plebs education was eventually subordinated to its other principle of labour movement control.

Education and the Labour Movement is a valuable and suggestive contribution to the history of both the labour movement and of English education. There are still problems to be examined in the period—the decline of the working class interest in natural science and the reasons for the degeneration of Labour College Marxism—among them: but Brian Simon has provided a feast of information and ideas. Volume III should be of even greater relevance to the present educational campaign.

H. J. Fyrth

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Index to Volume XLVII

I—AUTHORS

		Page
AMBATIELOS, Betty	Crisis in Greece	454
ANNIBOURNE, Neville	British Guiana: Elections and After	128
ANONYMOUS PRISONER	Buchenwald, April, 1945	170
ARNOT, R. Page	'Physician, Heal Thyself'!	273
BARR, Andrew	Incomes Policy	253
BATSA, Kofi	'African' Socialism	514
BEAUCHAMP, Kay	Natsopa—Seventy Five Years (R)	333
BERGER, John	The Freedom of Art (R)	526
BERNSTEIN, Hilda	South West Africa	231
BOND, Ralph	TUC: Lessons for Labour	446
BONNAR, Robert	The Future of Britain's Railways (R)	285
	Goodbye, Dr. Beeching	298
	The Great Trainmen's Robbery	558
BOWMAN, Dave	Redundancy and the Railwaymen (R)	431
BROWN, Alan	Who Controls Whom?	61
	George Brown (R)	143
BUKARI, Jane	Conference of African States	562
BURHOP, Dr. E. H. S.	Britain and Atomic Energy (R)	138
CAMPBELL, J. R.	How to Fight Price Rises	114
CASTRO, Fidel	Castro Speaks	354
CLIFF, John	Restrictive Practices	167
COLLINS, H.	Karl Marx and the British Labour Movement (Correspondence)	376
COLLINS, Canon L. John	Voices on Vietnam	213
COSTELLO, Michael	Unity in the Student World	227
COX, Idris	Congo and Counter Revolution	22
	On African Socialism (R)	143
	Britain and the Hungry Millions	162
	Development and Aid	222
	The Third World (R)	479
CUTHBERT, T.	The Struggle for Comprehensive Education	132
DELEGATE	A.E.U. National Committee 1965	258
DOUGLAS, Sid	In the Beginning Was Fear (R)	94
DOUGLASS, Stuart	'Anger' to Despair—Ten Years of English Drama	325
DUNN, Jack	My Life with the Miners (R)	190
DUTT, Clemens	In Honour of Bernal (R)	44
	Documents of the First International, 1866-1868 (R)	142
	Science in History (R)	526
DUTT, R. Palme	Notes of the Month: After Washington	1
	Notes of the Month: Coal, Oil and Britain	49
	Notes of the Month: 1. 'East of Suez'	97
	Notes of the Month: 2. Aircraft Industry	107
	Notes of the Month: Budget Battle	145
	Notes of the Month: Twenty Years After—And Now	193
	Notes of the Month: Commonwealth? Empire?	241
	Notes of the Month: Economic Storm Signals	337
	Notes of the Month: Labour's Assizes	385
	Notes of the Month: Blind 'Plan'	433
	Notes of the Month: Future of the Left	481
	Notes of the Month: Rhodesia—What Next?	529
	Etymology of Neo-Colonialism (R)	45
	Coal, Oil and Britain	320
	Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations (R)	333
EATON, John	Labour and the Technological Revolution	33
	Essays on Economic Policy Vols. I and II (R)	331
	Essays in the Economics of Socialism and Capitalism (R)	382
ELVIN, George	Film World (R)	92
ENISAH, C.	Freedom for South Arabia	372
FALBER, Helen	Inspiration, 48; Put 'LM' to Work! 96; Miners and 'LM', 144; Sales in 55 Countries, 192; Marching On, 240; War No More, 288; Budget for 'LM', 336; Local Asset, 384; Colour Blind, 432; Putting it in Perspective, 480; Views of Value, 528; Hands Off!	576
FORGE, Ken	Education (Communication)	181
FRANCIA, Peter de	Hiroshima 1945-1965 (Illustration)	360
FRANCIS, D.	Miners and Vietnam	510
FRANKENBERG, R.	Anthropologists Meet in Moscow	84
FYRTH, H. J.	Education and the Labour Movement (R)	570
GILL, Walter J.	The Rent Bill Must Be Re-Cast	218
GOODWIN, Phil	Students in Action	322
HARMEL, Michael	How Britain Appeases Apartheid	182
HENDERSON, Cllr. A. E.	Engineers' 'Package Deal'	111
HOBSBAWM, E. J.	The Internationale (R)	188
HOOD, Katherine	The Government of Great Britain (R) and Introduction to Politics (R)	332
HORNER, Arthur	Citrine and the T.U.C. (R)	88
HRONEK, Jiri	Open Letter to Mr. Michael Stewart	261
HUNT, Alan	Prospects for the Student Movement	277

(R) stands for Review throughout

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

		Page
HUTT, Allen	A Short History of the Labour Party (R)	382
JAGAN, Cheddi	Western Democracy on Trial in British Guiana	494
K.M.	Old Myths and New Realities (R)	286
KUCZYNSKI, Jurgen	Modern Agriculture Under Capitalism	38
	Modern Agriculture Under Socialism	74
LABOUR MONTHLY EDITORIAL	What the Conferences Decided	351
	Highlights of Trades Union Congress, 1925	416
	Nationalisation: A Live Issue	429
LAKEMAN, Enid	Electoral Reform (Communication)	180
LE BROCQ, Norman	Channel Islands Under Nazi Occupation	469
LEGAL CORRESPONDENT	The Kinross Election Petition	65
LIBERMAN, Professor Y. S.	Profit and 'Profits'	542
LORD, Mrs.	Letter from an American	272
MARX, Karl	Letter: 'On the Morrow of the Socialist Revolution'	502
McGAHEY, Mick	The Situation in Spain	177
	Coal—What Now?	349
McGREE, Leo	Incomes Policy	398
MILFORD, Lord	Voices on Vietnam	215
MILLNER, Q.C., Ralph	Racialism and the Law	314
MONCK, J.	Revolution in British Agriculture	118
MONTAGU, Ivor	Escalate Peace!	209
MORTIMER, J. E.	The Royal Commission on Trade Unions	204
MUNBY, Lionel	William Morris: The Man and the Myth (R)	46
NANDY, Dipak	Who is the Leper Now?	418
NIVEN, Barbara	Success and Failure of Picasso (R)	569
PARSONS, O. H.	The Worker and the Law (R)	381
PEET, John	Bonn Marches On	518
PITT, Dr. David	A Surrender to Racialism	450
PRITT, Q.C., D. N.	Shall Nazi Criminals Go Free?	82
	A Speaker's Conference	125
	Auschwitz in England (R)	239
	The True Society: A Philosophy of Labour (R)	334
	The First Hundred Days of Harold Wilson (R)	383
	Incorrigible Warmongers	566
QUAESTOR	A Real Alternative to M.L.F.	28
	The Queen in Germany	308
	Nuclear Bombs at Geneva	402
	Nuclear Arms and West Germany	548
RAMPLING, Tom	Co-Operative Movement (Communication)	180
RATHBONE, Hugo	The Root of the Crisis	16
RAYANE, B.	Algerian Students and the Coup	357
RICHMAN, Geoffrey	The Doctors' Case	172
ROTHSTEIN, Andrew	Profits and the Soviet Union	69
	Russia at War, 1941-45 (R)	237
	Marx and British Labour 1863-72 (R)	280
	A Time for Choice—and Action (Notes)	289
	Karl Marx and the British Labour Movement (Reply to Correspondence)	377
	British Labour in Marx's Day (R)	474
	Two Kinds of Plan	504
RYERSON, Stanley	Divided Canada	460
SEYD, Nicola	Student Militancy in America and Europe	464
SHANLEY, J. R.	The Life and Teaching of Karl Marx (R)	380
SLOAN, Pat	Some Essential Features of Nkrumahism (R)	93
	Afro-Asian Peoples Solidarity Conference, 1965	318
STACEY, B. G.	Automation and the Office Worker	78
THROGMORTON	International Liquidity	368
TODD, Judith	The Making of the Prime Minister (R)	284
TUCKETT, Angela	How They Held Down Wages	302
	'Willie' (Poem)	410
TOUBI, Tawfiq	Expropriation of Arab Land in Israel	135
VERNON, Tom	Prospects for Council Housing	362
	Land Nationalisation's Ghost	521
WALKER, Andrew	The Peace Movement Today	158
WALLACE, G. A.	Liner Trains (Correspondence)	367
WATEN, Judah	Going Back to Odessa	424
WILLIAMSON, J.	A Miner's Life (R)	237
	Subversion in the Trade Unions	411
WODDIS, Jack	Imperialist Counter Offensive in Africa	266
YOUNG, Cdr. E. P.	Commentators on Vietnam (R)	512
ZINKIN, Peter	Corridors of Power (R)	92

II—SUBJECTS

		Page
AFRICA	Congo and Counter Revolution	22
	On African Socialism (R)	143
	How Britain Appeases Apartheid	182
	South West Africa	231
	Imperialist Counter-Offensive in Africa	266
	African' Socialism	514
	Rhodesia—What Next?	529
	Conference of African States	562
AGRICULTURE	Modern Agriculture Under Capitalism	38
	Modern Agriculture Under Socialism	74

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

		Page
	Revolution in British Agriculture	118
AIRCRAFT	Aircraft Industry	107
ALGERIA	Castro Speaks	354
	Algerian Students and the Coup	357
ANTHROPOLOGY	Anthropologists Meet in Moscow	84
ART	The Freedom of Art (R)	526
	Success and Failure of Picasso (R)	569
ATOMIC ENERGY	Britain and Atomic Energy (R)	138
BRITISH GUIANA	British Guiana: Elections and After	128
	Western Democracy on Trial in British Guiana	494
CANADA	Divided Canada	460
CHANNEL ISLANDS	Channel Islands Under Nazi Occupation	469
COMMUNICATIONS	Co-Operative Movement, 180; Electoral Reform, 180; Education, 181; Letter from an American, 272; Liner Trains, ...	367
COMMONWEALTH and EMPIRE	Etymology of Neo-Colonialism (R)	45
	Commonwealth? Empire? (Notes)	241
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	Open Letter to Mr. Michael Stewart	261
DRAMA	'Anger' to Despair: Ten Years of English Drama ...	325
ECONOMIC SITUATION	The Root of the Crisis	16
	Coal, Oil and Britain (Notes)	49 and 320
	Who Controls Whom?	61
	How to Fight Price Rises	114
	Budget Battle (Notes)	145
	Britain and the Hungry Millions	162
	Economic Storm Signals (Notes)	337
	International Liquidity	368
EDUCATION	**The Struggle for Comprehensive Education**	132
	Education (Communication)	181
	Education and the Labour Movement (R)	570
GENERAL ELECTION	The Kinross Election Petition	65
	Electoral Reform (Communication)	181
GREECE	Crisis in Greece: A Struggle for Democracy	454
HEALTH SERVICE	**The Doctors' Case**	172
	'Physician, Heal Thyself'!	273
HOUSING, LAND & RENTS	The Rent Bill Must Be Re-Cast	218
	Prospects in Council Housing	362
	Land Nationalisation's Ghost	521
IMMIGRATION AND RACIALISM	Racialism and the Law	314
	Who is the Leper Now?	418
	A Surrender to Racialism	450
INCOMES POLICY	**Incomes Policy**	253
	How They Held Down Wages	302
	Incomes Policy	398
	Blind 'Plan' (Notes)	433
	Two Kinds of Plan	504
ISRAEL	Expropriation of Arab Land in Israel	135
LABOUR MOVEMENT	Labour and the Technological Revolution	33
	Automation and the Office Worker	78
	Budget Battle (Notes)	145
	A Time for Choice—and Action (Notes)	289
	Labour's Assizes (Notes)	385
	Blind 'Plan' (Notes)	433
	Future of the Left (Notes)	481
MARX	Marx and British Labour 1863-72 (R)	280
	Karl Marx and the British Labour Movement (Correspondence & Reply)	377
	The Life and Teaching of Karl Marx (R)	380
	British Labour in Marx's Day (R)	474
	On the Morrow of the Socialist Revolution	502
MIDDLE EAST	Freedom for South Arabia	372
MINING	Coal, Oil and Britain	49 and 320
	Coal—What Now?	349
NATIONALISATION	Nationalisation: A Live Issue	429
	Land Nationalisation's Ghost	521
NATO	The Nato Lobby	270
OBITUARIES	D. J. F. Parsons	257
	I. T. A. Wallace-Johnson	317
	William Gallacher	408
	Canon Stanley Evans	468
PARLIAMENT	A Speaker's Conference	125
POEM	'Willie'	410
RAILWAYS	The Future of Britain's Railways (R)	285
	Goodbye, Dr. Beeching	298
	Liner Trains	367
	Redundancy and the Railwaymen (R)	431
	The Great Trainmen's Robbery	558
SPAIN	The Situation in Spain	177
STUDENTS' MOVEMENT	Unity in the Student World	227
	Prospects for the Student Movement	277
	Students in Action	322
	Algerian Students and the Coup	357
	Student Militancy in America and Europe	464
TRADE UNION MOVEMENT	Citrine and the T.U.C. (R)	88
	Engineers' 'Package Deal'	111
	Restrictive Practices	167

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

		Page
	My Life with the Miners (R)	190
	The Royal Commission on Trade Unions	204
	Incomes Policy	253
	A.E.U. National Committee	258
	Natsopa—Seventy Five Years	333
	What the Conferences Decided	351
	Incomes Policy	398
	Highlights of Trades Union Congress 1925	416
	T.U.C.: Lessons for Labour	446
	Miners and Vietnam	510
U.S.A.	Subversion in the Trade Unions	411
U.S.S.R.	Profits and the Soviet Union	69
	Russia at War, 1941-45 (R)	237
	Going Back to Odessa	424
	Two Kinds of Plan	504
	Profit and 'Profits'	542
VIETNAM	Voices on Vietnam	213
	Letter from an American	272
	Miners and Vietnam	510
	Commentators on Vietnam	512
WAR AND PEACE	After Washington (Notes)	1
	A Real Alternative to MLF	28
	'East of Suez' (Notes)	97
	The Peace Movement Today	158
	Buchenwald, April, 1945	170
	Twenty Years After—And Now (Notes)	193
	Escalate Peace!	209
	Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Conference 1965	318
	Nuclear Bombs at Geneva	402
WEST GERMANY	Shall Nazi Criminals Go Free?	82
	The Queen in Germany	308
	Bonn Marches On	518
	Nuclear Arms and West Germany	548
	Incorrigible Warmongers	566

BOOKS REVIEWED

Author or Editor	Title (and Reviewer)	Page
Arnot, R. Page	**William Morris: The Man and the Myth** (Lionel Munby)	46
Arundel, Honor	**Freedom of Art** (John Berger)	526
Berger, John	**Success and Failure of Picasso** (B. Niven)	569
Bernal, J. D.	**Science in History** (Clemens Dutt)	526
Brophy, John	**A Miner's Life** (J. Williamson)	237
Calvert, R.	**The Future of Britain's Railways** (Bob Bonnar)	285
Cassandra	**George Brown** (Alan Brown)	143
Citrine, Sir Walter	**Men and Work** (Arthur Horner)	88
Collins, Henry and Abramsky, Chimen ...	**Karl Marx and the British Labour Movement** (Andrew Rothstein)	280
Crozier, Brian	**Neo-Colonialism** (R.P.D.)	45
Dutt, R. Palme	**The Internationale** (E. J. Hobsbawm)	188
Fulbright, Senator	**Old Myths and New Realities** (K.M.)	286
Goldsmith, M. and Mackay, A.	**The Science of Science** (Clemens Dutt)	44
Gowing, Margaret	**Britain and Atomic Energy, 1939-45** (Dr. E. H. S. Burhop)	138
Halberstam, David	**The Making of a Quagmire** (Cdr. Young)	513
Harrison, Royden	**Before the Socialists** (Andrew Rothstein)	474
Hill, Mavis and Williams, L. Norman ...	**Auschwitz in England** (D.N.P.)	239
Howard, A. and West R. ...	**The Making of the Prime Minister** (Judith Todd) ...	284
International Working-men's Association, General Council	**Documents of the First International, Vol. II** (Clemens Dutt)	142
Kaldor, Nicholas	**Essays on Economic Policy, Vol. I and Vol. II** (John Eaton)	331
Lewis, John	**Life and Teaching of Karl Marx** (J. R. Shanley)	380
Marx, Karl	**Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations** (R.P.D.)	333
Moffat, Abe	**My Life With the Miners** (Jack Dunn)	190
Montagu, Ivor	**Film World** (George Elvin)	92
Moodie Graeme	**The Government of Great Britain** (Katherine Hood) ...	332
Moran James	**Natsopa—Seventy Five Years** (Kay Beauchamp)	333
Murray, Robin	**Vietnam: No. 1 in the Read-In Series** (Cdr. Young) ...	512
Pelling, Henry	**A Short History of the Labour Party** (Allen Hutt) ...	382
Pickles, Dorothy M.	**Introduction to Politics** (Katherine Hood)	332
Seedo, N. M.	**In the Beginning Was Fear** (Sid Douglas)	94
Senghor, Leopold Sedar ...	**On African Socialism** (Idris Cox)	143
Shrimsley, Anthony	**The First Hundred Days of Harold Wilson** (D. N. Pritt)	383
Simon, Brian	**Education and the Labour Movement** (H. J. Fyrth) ...	570
Smyth, R. L.	**Essays in the Economics of Socialism and Capitalism** (J. Eaton)	382
Snow, C. P.	**Corridors of Power** (Peter Zinkin)	92
Tannenbaum, Frank	**The True Society: A Philosophy of Labour** (D. N. Pritt)	334
Warbey, William	**Vietnam: The Truth** (Cdr. Young)	512
Wedderburn, Dorothy ...	**Redundancy and the Railwaymen** (D. Bowman)	431
Wedderburn, Professor K. W.	**The Worker and the Law** (O. H. Parsons)	381
Werth, Alexander	**Russia at War, 1941-45** (Andrew Rothstein)	237
Worsley, Peter	**The Third World** (Idris Cox)	479

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HANDS OFF!

ALTHOUGH it is certainly not unusual for the establishment press to slant its news with a deliberately anti-working class bias, the current outbursts by sections of the lower-level newspapers sink to new depths in their malicious personal attacks on trade union militants. The more effective their leadership, the more vicious the slanders against them. Letters from all over the country denote the sharp reaction of our trade unionist readers: 'How aptly *L.M.* hits the nail on the head', writes a Tyneside engineer, 'pointing out that the offensive against unions and shop stewards is now the front line of the battle. I feel this calls for other workers to get their shot-and-shell from *L.M.* as I do—please use this cash to send copies to the names enclosed'. Backing up his theory in a practical way!

A Yorkshire railwayman thinks that the younger trade unionist knows too little of the early struggles to build our great movement: 'This is the kind of job *L.M.* is so well equipped to do, with all the historical background at its disposal'.

The last word from a miner, elected to a responsible union position after a proud record in his industry: 'I will continue to keep the flag flying in the interests of the miners and the working-class much more effectively through the knowledge and education I receive from *L.M.*'.

Helen Falber.

£44 10s. 3d.

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: H. Brindle, 5s; Two Tynesiders, 5s; Southend Branch, 12s 6d; S. Morrissy £1; E. Strachan Rogers, £3 3s; L. Bates, 10s; Blackburn Branch, 6s; Oldham Branch, 4s; S. Mill, £1; Marie Philibert, 10s; B. W. Mackay, 4s 6d; Stockport Santa, 10s; W. Chester, 1s 6d; 'J', 10s; Len Perkins, 2s 6d; R.F.B., £3; D. H. Strathern and Friends, 10s; A. Corbett, £1; Nellie Usher 2s 6d; M. Illing, £1; G.I., 2s 6d; S. Townsend, £1; E. Sheldon, 10s; L'Humanité, 5s; 'Oliver Twist and Friends' 15s; J. E. Atkinson, 5s 4d; R. McLeod, 5s; F.G.A., £1; 'Humphreys Family', 5s; 'Pax', 5s; Highgate Reader, 6s; J. A. Purton 7s 6d; E.J.B., 10s; 'Socialist Sailor', £1; H.L. (U.S.A.), £5; A.M.T. (for Fernando and Guilherme), 1s.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include: E. M. Berlyn, 8s; A. Robins, 19s; A.A.M. 6s; J. Whelan, 6s 8d; L.H. (New Zealand), 6s; C. Allen, 9s; J. Lester, 9s; J. Walkinshaw, 12s; M. H. Panahi, £1; 'American Democrat', £3 10s; R. Wrightson, £3 19s; S. Carr, 10s; 'West Indian', 10s; R. F. Finch, 9s; R. Herring, 4s 9d; E.F. (U.S.A.), 18s; 'For Services Rendered', £3.

Our thanks to you all.
Co-op. No. L.99482.

134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.
FINchley 5135.

Published by the proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Wembley News, Wembley, Middlesex, Great Britain. Registered for transmission by Magazine Post to Canada, including Newfoundland.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY NOT BY POST ?

It's quicker—and it's cheaper too !

NAME .....
(Please use block capitals)

ADDRESS .....

.....

.....

I enclose 21s. (Overseas, 24s., Canada and USA, $3.50), for year's subscription from the.....issue.

(SIGNED) .....

To LABOUR MONTHLY
134, BALLARDS LANE,
LONDON, N·3

MIMETTE FURS LTD.

Wide range of furs, coats, stoles and capes.

117, High Street, Croydon, Surrey.
'Phone CROydon 4328

Binder Bros. Ltd.

Building and decorating by craftsmen

TOTtenham 2362

For all interested in the fight for Peace and Progress in the Countryside and the problems of Socialist Agriculture.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD

Quarterly 6d. By post 9d.
Annual Subscription 3/- Post free or
Send 3d. stamp for specimen copy.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD
27, Bedford St. Strand, London W.C.2

LABOUR RESEARCH
Tory Interests in Rhodesia
Wage Comparisons
1s. or 1s. 3d. by post
LABOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT
78, Blackfriars Rd., London, S.E.1

PREGNANCY TESTING

Rapid, accurate, reliable
Send small urine sample and 2 Gns. fee
Dept. LM.
HADLEY LABORATORIES LTD.
18 Harvist Road, London, N.W.6

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

(3s. 6d. a line, minimum, 10s. 6d. Cash with order to: 'Class Ads.', Labour Monthly, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.)

5S. PIECES WANTED. £10 each paid for the following: 1818 to 1820, 1826, 1831, 1839, 1844, 1902, 1927 to 1934. 5s. pieces must be in F.D.C. mint condition for this price. Searle, No. 10 Office, Bridge House, Newton Abbot (*L.M.*).

WE BUY BOOKS, pamphlets: Socialism, U.S.S.R., Comintern, Spain. We collect: PRO 7254. The Hammersmith Bookshop, Liffords Pl., S.W.13.

KENT—RAMSGATE & DISTRICT. For details of properties for sale apply: LESLIE HOGBIN & PARTNERS, 48, Queen Street, Ramsgate. Tel. Thanet 53222.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Labour Monthly

Bound Volume for 1965

A history of the year's events !

A permanent record

A 'must' for every labour movement Library.

ORDERS BEING TAKEN NOW!

Through your usual newsagents, price £1 10s 0d, or send 10s 6d plus 1s 6d postage and your loose copies as soon as possible to:

THE MANAGER.
134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

A gift for 52 of the 53 weeks of 1966 !

SOVIET WEEKLY

can solve your gift problem by its offer of

GIFT SUBSCRIPTIONS

at a greatly reduced rate.

Normally 6d a week, you can have it sent to a friend for one year for 17s 6d. Send your name and address and that of the friend of your choice with a P.O. or cheque for 17s 6d, and your greeting.

WE WILL SEND TO YOUR FRIEND

- **SOVIET WEEKLY by post for one year (or 6 months for 9s).**
- **Your message on a greetings card and a complimentary copy of the enlarged Christmas issue of Soviet Weekly.**

You may send as many gift subscriptions as you wish.

SOVIET WEEKLY, Circulation Dept. (L.M.), 3 Rosary Gardens, London, S.W.7.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED